

APPROVED MINUTES

JOINT MEETING

STATE REVIEW BOARD and BOARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

9:00 a. m. September 15, 2016

Academy Center of the Arts, Joy and Lynch Christian Warehouse Theatre, 609 Commerce Street, Lynchburg, VA 24504

Elizabeth Moore, Chair
Joseph D. Lahendro, Vice-Chair
Dr. Sara Bon-Harper
Dr. Laurant Lee
Dr. Carl Lounsbury
John Salmon

Clyde Paul Smith, Vice-Chair
Margaret T. Peters
Dr. Ashley Atkins-Spivey
Dr. Colita Nichols Fairfax
Frederick S. Fisher
Drew Gruber
Nosuk Pak Kim

State Review Board Members Absent

Dr. Gabrielle Lanier

Historic Resources Board Members Absent

None

Department of Historic Resources Staff Present

Julie Langan, Director
David Edwards
Marc Wagner
Melina Bezirdjian
Michael Pulice
Elizabeth Lipford

Stephanie Williams, Deputy Director
Aubrey Von Lindern
Jennifer Pullen
Lena Sweeten McDonald
Jen Loux
Joanna Wilson Green

Guests present (from sign-in sheet) – Sandra Esposito (Elon Village Public Library); Adam Gillenwater (Civil War Trust); Florence F. Nixon (Elon Village Public Library); Holcomb R. Nixon (Elon Village Public Library); Barbara and T. Nelson Keech (Springdale); Thomas Lawson (Reynolds Property); Joe Obenshain (Blue Ridge Hall); Elizabeth Obenshain (Blue Ridge Hall); Barbara Reiger (Locustville Academy); Penne Sandbeck (Locustville Academy); Steve D. Tyree (Elon Village Public Library); Bob Walker (underwater archaeologist)

Guests from State Agencies – Catherine Ayres Shankles and Katherine Surface Burks (Office of the Attorney General)

State Review Board (SRB)

Chair Elizabeth Moore called the SRB meeting to order at 9:24 a.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance. She said that the agenda has been modified to include remarks from the Mayor of the City of Lynchburg at 10:00 a.m. She asked for a motion to approve the meeting agenda as corrected. With a motion from Vice-Chair Lahendro and a second from Dr. Lee, the SRB voted unanimously to approve the agenda as corrected. Chair Moore invited the SRB members to introduce themselves.

Chair Moore then presented the June 16, 2016, meeting minutes and asked for any corrections to the minutes. No corrections were made. With a motion from Dr. Lounsbury and a second from Dr. Lee, the minutes were approved as presented.

Board of Historic Resources Board (BHR)

Vice-Chair Clyde Smith called the BHR meeting to order and invited the members to introduce themselves. BHR member Drew Gruber joined the meeting by telephone and introduced himself. Vice-Chair Smith explained the role of the BHR and welcomed Bob Walker, an underwater archaeologist from Richmond, to the meeting. Vice-Chair Smith presented the June 16, 2016, meeting minutes and asked for a motion to approve the minutes. With a motion from Ms. Peters and a second from Ms. Atkins-Spivey, the BHR voted unanimously to approve the minutes as presented. Vice-Chair Smith asked for a motion to approve the agenda as corrected. With a motion from Ms. Atkins-Spivey and a second from Ms. Kim, the BHR voted unanimously to approve the agenda as corrected.

Proclamation

Vice-Chair Smith read a proclamation into the record acknowledging the service of Eleanor Western Brown on the Board of Historic Resources, and the text of a commemorative highway marker facsimile summarizing Ms. Brown's contributions.

Elections – Board of Historic Resources

Vice-Chair Smith explained that the Board of Historic Resources elects its officers to one-year terms at its September meeting each year. He requested nominations for the position of Vice-Chair. Mr. Gruber nominated Ms. Peters to serve as Vice-Chair. With a second from Dr. Atkins-Spivey, the BHR voted unanimously to elect Ms. Peters to serve as Vice-Chair.

Vice-Chair Smith asked for nominations for the position of Chair. Ms. Peters nominated Mr. Smith to serve as Chair. Vice-Chair Smith asked for any other nominations; none were made. Vice-Chair Smith asked for a vote on the nomination and the BHR voted unanimously to elect Mr. Smith to serve as Chair.

Approval of 2017 meeting schedule

Chair Moore presented the proposed 2017 meeting schedule to the SRB. With a motion from Vice-Chair Lahendro and a second from Dr. Lee, the SRB voted unanimously to approve the schedule as presented.

Chair Smith presented the proposed 2017 meeting schedule to the BHR and asked for a motion to approve it. With a motion from Vice-Chair Peters and a second from Ms. Kim, the BHR voted unanimously to approve the schedule as presented.

The 2017 meeting schedule will be March 16, June 15, September 21, and December 14.

Chair Moore explained the role of the SRB in the nomination process.

Director's Report (DHR)

Director Langan thanked the City of Lynchburg and staff of the Academy Center of the Arts for hosting the joint meeting. She acknowledged local resident Jane White for her work in planning the meeting and thanked architectural historian Al Chambers and Mary Catherine McIntosh for leading a tour of historic Lynchburg yesterday.

She summarized the recent request for agencies of the Commonwealth to reduce budgets by 5% in the current fiscal year and explained that this was the latest in a series of cuts made in recent years. Director Langan said that DHR will be reducing expenses, including travel, costs for Board meeting, and grants that are administered by DHR. Another budget cut is anticipated for the 2018 state fiscal year. DHR is developing a plan for the current budget cut and for the anticipated cut in the 2018 fiscal year.

Director Langan explained that DHR has closed its office in Petersburg as part of the current budget cuts and is relocating four staff members to the Richmond central office. She updated the Board members on an examination of the state historic tax credit program by the General Assembly's joint subcommittee to reexamine all of the Commonwealth's tax preferences. Subcommittee members have expressed a desire to reduce the Commonwealth's costs for the historic tax credits. Director Langan said DHR hopes to have time to update a 2014 study that analyzed the economic impact of the historic tax credit program before any decisions are made. She noted that the tax credits have been used all over Virginia in rural and urban areas, including in the building where the Boards convened today.

Director Langan said that DHR is working with a task force established by the Governor's office to recommend best practices to assist local governments that are addressing issues related to Confederate monuments on public property. She reported that DHR will publish a commemorative issue of *Notes on Virginia* as part of the 50th anniversary of DHR's establishment, as well as the Virginia Landmarks Register and the National Register of Historic Places. Other commemorative activities have included improvements to DHR's website, a launch of an online publication of the *Virginia Landmarks Register*, and a workshop series across Virginia in cooperation with Preservation Virginia.

Director Langan added that DHR will soon be awarding battlefield preservation grants. Seventeen applications were received. Awards are expected to be made in October. DHR is instituting new programs for donors of easements. The first event will be a tour of Monumental Church of Richmond on October 12. The BHR and SRB members are invited to attend as well. Additional events are being planned. Director Langan said the statewide annual Virginia Preservation Conference will be October 16-17 in Charlottesville. This year's conference theme is heritage tourism. DHR cosponsors the conference with Preservation Virginia. She said Preservation Virginia has just finished an economic impact study on what heritage tourism contributes to Virginia's economy. A showing of a new film about Rosenwald Schools will be part of the conference program, as well as a cemetery workshop. Director Langan mentioned that Kathleen Kilpatrick has announced her retirement from the Capitol Square Preservation Planning Commission; Kilpatrick also is a previous director of DHR.

NOMINATIONS

The following Eastern Region nominations were presented as a block by Mr. Marc Wagner, after which public comment and discussion by the Boards took place.

Eastern Region.....presented by Marc Wagner

1. Hampton National Guard Armory, City of Hampton, #114-5001, Criterion C
2. **Suffolk Peanut Company, City of Suffolk, #133-5568, Criteria A and C

3. **Virginia Commission for the Blind, City of Richmond, #127-6808, Criteria B and C

Comments made:

Chair Moore asked about the Suffolk Peanut Company nomination being the first for this resource type in Virginia, and whether more nominations are anticipated for peanut-related facilities. Mr. Wagner said there are few documented properties with high levels of integrity as the Suffolk Peanut Company has and that he has not received any inquiries for similar properties. Concerning the nomination for the Virginia Commission for the Blind, Vice-Chair Lahendro said that a facility for blind workers is within a proposed historic district in Charlottesville.

Chair Moore invited public comment regarding the nominations. No comments were made.

Chair Moore requested a motion to approve the nominations as presented. With a motion from Dr. Bon-Harper and a second from Dr. Lee, the SRB voted unanimously to approve the nominations as presented.

Chair Smith requested a motion to approve the nominations as presented. With a motion from Vice-Chair Peters and a second from Ms. Kim, the BHR voted unanimously to approve the nominations as presented.

Dr. Fairfax said that the Hampton National Guard Armory is in a historic area of Hampton that also includes an 1830s cemetery and the First Baptist Church, founded in 1863. The Armory is adjacent to the Pasture Point Historic District as well.

Chair Smith introduced Mayor Joan Foster of Lynchburg, who welcomed everyone to the city. She explained the city's revitalization efforts in downtown, and thanked the Boards for holding their meeting in Lynchburg. She invited everyone to enjoy the city's public square and walks through the historic downtown. Chair Smith asked about the economic return on historic tax credits for the city. Mayor Foster said that the City realizes about \$3 in return for every \$1 invested in historic tax credit projects. She said the City also created a \$1 million fund to help finance rehabilitation projects in 2010, and this fund will be up for reauthorization in 2020. She mentioned a new rehabilitation project in the works for a former flour factory.

The following Eastern Region nominations were presented as a block by Ms. Elizabeth Lipford, after which public comment and discussion by the Boards took place.

Eastern Region.....presented by Elizabeth Lipford

1. Edenetta, Essex County, #028-0010, Criteria A and C
2. Locustville Academy, Accomack County, #001-0103, Criteria A and C

Comments made:

Chair Moore invited public comment regarding the nominations. Barbara Riker, president of the Board of Trustees of the Locustville Academy, thanked the Boards for their consideration of the nomination and said they hope that Register designation will aid their efforts to obtain grants for the property's upkeep. Vice-Chair Lahendro said he was impressed with the way the community rallied around the building to preserve it and how it preserves the technology of early 20th century education methods. He added that the presence of wood shingles under the belfry implied to him that the belfry dates to the second period of the school's operation starting in 1908. Nomination author Penne Sandbeck said similar belfry examples from other early 20th century schools in the area have been identified. Mary Hile, of the Society for the Preservation of Locustville Academy, said the building's preservation has been altruistic as the property has never been used for income-generating purposes.

Chair Moore requested a motion to approve the nominations as presented. With a motion from Vice-Chair Lahendro and a second from Dr. Lounsbury, the SRB voted unanimously to approve the nominations as presented.

Chair Smith requested a motion to approve the nominations as presented. With a motion from Dr. Atkins-Spivey and a second from Vice-Chair Peters, the BHR voted unanimously to approve the nominations as presented.

The Northern Region nominations were presented as a block by Ms. Aubrey Von Lindern, after which public comment and discussion by the Boards took place.

Northern Region.....presented by Aubrey Von Lindern

1. Mount Calvary Baptist Church, Orange County, #068-0417, Criterion A, Criteria Considerations A and D
2. Springdale, Frederick County, #034-0103, Criterion C

Comments made:

Chair Moore invited public comment regarding the nominations. Chair Smith thanked the owners of Springdale, Barbara and Nelson Keech, who attended the meeting. Ms. Keech explained that she had been working on the property's historic documentation since 1993

and thanked Ms. Von Lindern for her assistance with the nomination project. She added that she thinks the work of DHR and the Boards is important to preserving Virginia's historic properties.

Chair Moore requested a motion to approve the nominations as presented. With a motion from Dr. Bon-Harper and a second from Dr. Lee, the SRB voted unanimously to approve the nominations as presented.

Chair Smith requested a motion to approve the nominations as presented. With a motion from Mr. Gruber and a second from Ms. Kim, the BHR voted unanimously to approve the nominations as presented.

The Western Region nominations were presented as a block by Mr. Michael Pulice, after which public comment and discussion by the Boards took place.

Western Region.....presented by Michael Pulice

1. Blue Ridge Hall, Botetourt County, #011-5096, Criteria A and C
2. Elon Village Public Library, Amherst County, #005-0044, Criteria A and C
3. Reed Creek Mill, Town of Wytheville, Wythe County, #139-5142, Criteria A and C
4. Reynolds Property, Botetourt County, #011-0138, Criteria A and C

Comments made:

Chair Moore invited public comment regarding the nominations. Joe Obenshain and his wife Marsha Obenshain said that the Blue Ridge Hall has been in their family since about 1849. Elizabeth Obenshain owns the neighboring family farm. He thanked Mike Pulice for helping to trace the property's history. Ms. Obenshain noted that the neighboring family farm has a conservation easement that helps protect the viewshed of Blue Ridge Hall.

Representatives for the Elon Village Public Library introduced themselves. Florence and Holcomb Nixon spoke about their work on documenting and preserving the library's history. A neighboring owner, Steve Tyree, thanked the Nixons for their work in helping to preserve various historic properties in Elon.

Thomas Lawson spoke on behalf of O&M Minerals regarding the Reynolds Property. He explained that mining in the area has taken place in the vicinity since the late 18th century and continues today. He said the Reynolds Property currently is the subject of litigation in federal courts regarding the continuation of mining in the area. Mr. Lawson said a history professor at Virginia Military Institute (VMI) argues that the stone building located at the Reynolds Property is not a house, but is shown on a Civil War-era map as a "stone cabin," and he expressed doubt that the stone building has historic significance because he believes it has been rebuilt more than once. Mr. Lawson brought up an item of litigation concerning whether the extant stone building is referred to in a historic deed that prohibits quarrying in a dwelling yard, and argued that the deed refers to a no-longer-extant manor house. He said that the federal litigation is expected to be heard in federal court in January 2017 and requested that the Boards postpone a vote on the property's Register designation until the court matter is settled. Mr. Lawson stated his belief that the property will not be preserved because it is zoned for mining purposes and has been for decades.

DHR's Jim Hare explained that the question before the Boards is whether the property meets the criteria for listing in the NRHP and VLR. Chair Smith asked if the professional opinion of staff is that it does. Mr. Hare said yes. Chair Smith asked if the pending legal case affects anything with regard to Register designation. Catherine Shankles said that Register designation should not affect the outcome of the legal case or the mineral rights owners' ability to mine the property.

Chair Smith asked Mr. Lawson if there is a reason for the Boards not to approve the designation.

Mr. Lawson said that the court decision could be awaited because it may establish that the stone building is not the dwelling referenced in historic records.

Vice-Chair Peters said that the property's historic significance is being considered today, not what its historic use may have been. Ms. Shankles said the court case should not be affected by whether the property is listed in the Registers. Chair Moore noted that the Register designation is honorary.

Vice-Chair Peters asked about the objection of the mineral rights owner concerning the nomination and how that comes into play with the designation. Chair Moore said that two owners are in favor of the nomination and one mineral rights owner has objected.

Chair Moore requested a motion to approve the nominations as presented. With a motion from Vice-Chair Lahendro and a second from Dr. Lee, the SRB voted unanimously to approve the nomination as presented.

Chair Smith requested a motion to approve the nomination as presented. Mr. Fisher clarified that for the Reynolds Property, with the owners of surface rights applying for the nomination and one mineral rights owner objecting, the rights of neither are affected by approval

of the nomination. With a motion from Ms. Kim and a second from Dr. Fairfax, the BHR voted unanimously to approve the nomination as presented.

Delistings.....presented by Melina Bezirdjian

The following properties have been demolished and are proposed for removal from the Virginia Landmarks Register and the National Register of Historic Places.

1. Donk's Theatre, Mathews County, #057-0069 – Property was rendered structurally unsound by a blizzard and later demolished.
2. Bob White Covered Bridge, Patrick County, #070-0027 – Property was washed away by a flash flood.
3. Central State Hospital Chapel, Dinwiddie County, #026-0123-0005 – Property has been demolished.
4. The Circle, City of Portsmouth, #124-5089 – Property has been demolished.
5. Rose Cottage/Peyton House, City of Charlottesville, #104-0230 – Property was demolished in 1991 after a fire.
6. Woodlawn, Pittsylvania County, #071-0037 – Property has been demolished.
7. Wolfrap Farm, Isle of Wight County, #046-0070 – Property has been demolished.
8. Bloomsbury Farm, Spotsylvania County, #088-0001 – Property has been demolished.
9. Huntington Tugboat, City of Norfolk, #122-5002 – Property has been entirely dismantled.

Comments made:

Mr. Gruber, who had been attending the meeting via telephone, departed at 11:56 a.m.

Chair Moore invited public comment regarding the proposed delistings. Dr. Lounsbury said the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation has photographic documentation about the Wolfrap Farm. Chair Moore noted that the delistings demonstrate that Register designation does not guarantee protection of a historic property nor prohibit a property owner from demolishing a Register-listed property.

Chair Moore requested a motion to approve the delistings as presented. With a motion from Dr. Bon-Harper and a second from Dr. Lee, the SRB voted unanimously to approve the delistings as presented.

Dr. Atkins-Spivey asked about the archaeological potential for each property being evaluated. Ms. McDonald said the delisting process includes evaluation for archaeological potential before the delisting process is initiated. Vice-Chair Peters noted that DHR retains documentation for delisted properties as part of DHR's permanent archives.

Chair Smith requested a motion to approve the delistings as presented. With a motion from Dr. Atkins-Spivey and a second from Ms. Kim, the BHR voted unanimously to approve the delistings as presented.

The joint meeting adjourned at 12:08 p.m.

Register Summary of Resources Listed:

Historic Districts:	0
Buildings:	11
Structures:	0
Sites:	0
Objects:	0
MPDs:	0
Delistings:	9

BOARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Academy Center of the Arts, Joy and Lynch Christian Warehouse Theatre, 609 Commerce Street, Lynchburg, VA 24504

Board of Historic Resources Members Present:

Clyde Paul Smith, Chair
Margaret T. Peters, Vice-Chair
Dr. Ashley Atkins-Spivey
Frederick S. Fisher
Nosuk Pak Kim
Dr. Colita Nichols Fairfax

Historic Resources Board Members Absent:

Drew Gruber

Department of Historic Resources (DHR) Staff Present:

Julie Langan, Director
Stephanie Williams, Deputy Director
Jennifer Pullen
Elizabeth Tune
Gillian Bearns
Jennifer Loux
Wendy Musumeci
Joanna Wilson Green
Jim Hare

Other State Agency Staff Present:

Catherine Shankles (Office of the Attorney General)

Guests Present:

Kelvin Hawkins (Highway Markers-St. John's Rosenwald School)
Brenda Stankus (Highway Markers-Italians in Richmond)
Ray Garguilo (Highway Markers-Italians in Richmond)
John Hutchinson (Shenandoah Valley Battlefield Foundation)
Adam Gillenwater (Civil War Trust)
William Johnson (Highway markers)

HIGHWAY MARKERS

Mr. Smith, Chair, reconvened the meeting of the Virginia Board of Historic Resources at 12:45 p.m., described the role of the Board and noted there was a quorum of the members present.

Jen Loux, Highway Marker Historian, introduced herself and presented the Sponsor Markers – Diversity, Sponsor Markers, and Sponsor-funded Replacement Markers.

Sponsor Markers - Diversity

1. Virginia Teachers Association

Sponsor: Virginia Education Association
Locality: Lynchburg
Proposed Location: 901 Jackson St.

2. St. John School—Rosenwald Funded

Sponsor: St. John Family Life and Fitness Center, Inc.
Locality: Albemarle County
Proposed Location: 1569 St. John Road, Keswick

3. First Baptist Church

Sponsor: First Baptist Church
Locality: Northumberland County
Proposed Location: 3585 Courthouse Road, Heathsville

Sponsor Markers

1. John Pratt Hungerford (1761-1833)

Sponsor: Northern Neck of Virginia Historical Society
Locality: Westmoreland County
Proposed Location: Rte. 637 (Leedstown Road) at entrance to Leedstown Camp Grounds

2. Italians in Richmond

Sponsor: The Order Sons of Italy, Giuseppe Verdi Lodge #315
Locality: Richmond City
Proposed Location: Pollock Park

3. Blue Ridge Turnpike

Sponsor: Madison County Historical Society
Locality: Madison County
Proposed Location: 1106 Old Blue Ridge Turnpike, Madison

Brenda Stankus of Richmond stated that she grew up in Richmond and that at least one-hundred homes in the North Highland Park neighborhood could be identified as having been occupied by Italian families. These people were skilled tradesmen in marble, stone and

ornamental plaster, many of whom came from Tuscany to take jobs in the Richmond area. Mr. Ray Garguilo thanked Ms. Loux for her help throughout the process.

Replacement Markers (Sponsor-funded)

1. Gen. George C. Marshall House

Sponsor: George C. Marshall House

Locality: Leesburg

Proposed Location: 312 East Market Street

2. Mullins Family XB-13

Sponsor: Dickenson County Historical Society

Locality: Dickenson County

Proposed Location: Rte. T-1009, at Rte. 83, Clintwood

Chair Smith made a motion to approve the Sponsor Markers – Diversity, Sponsor Markers, and Sponsor-funded Replacement Markers as proposed. The motion was seconded by Ms. Peters, and the Board voted unanimously to approve the markers.

Dr. Atkins-Spivey recused herself from the discussion and vote on the marker for the Pamunkey Indians in the Civil War, left the table, and took a seat in the audience.

TEA-Funded Marker - Diversity

1. Pamunkey Indians in the Civil War

Sponsor: DHR (TEA)

Locality: King William County

Proposed Location: intersection of King William Rd (Rt. 30) and Powhatan Trail (Rt. 633)

Ms. Peters made a motion to approve the marker for the Pamunkey Indians in the Civil War. The motion was seconded by Mr. Fisher and the Board voted unanimously to approve the marker.

Ms. Peters asked whether the marker would be placed at the King William Courthouse, and Ms. Loux responded that the proposed location is at the main road leading into the Pamunkey Indian Reservation, where two other markers are already located.

Dr. Atkins-Spivey spoke as a member of the public to thank Ms. Loux for her help and for DHR's sponsoring the marker.

Replacement Markers

Ms. Loux provided background information about \$2 million in funding provided by the Virginia General Assembly to the Virginia Department of Transportation ("VDOT"), a portion of which is dedicated to replacement of deteriorated or otherwise outdated highway markers. Approximately 200 markers have been identified by VDOT as beyond repair. The project also provides the opportunity to write new text to provide additional information in keeping with modern scholarship and research techniques, and to correct factual errors. Ms. Loux asked for the Board's approval of the proposed text for 46 replacement markers, which was provided to the Board prior to the meeting.

Chair Smith noted that the proposed marker text would be made available by the Department to interested members of the public. Ms. Shankles asked that the Board amend the meeting agenda to include the 46 replacement markers. Dr. Fairfax made a motion to amend the agenda to include consideration of the proposed 46 replacement markers. Dr. Atkins-Spivey seconded the motion and the Board voted unanimously to approve the motion.

Ms. Loux pointed out that based on further research the marker text for the Big Crab Orchard Fort was subsequently revised from the version sent to the Board. Chair Smith asked for an amended motion to reflect the revised language for the Big Crab Orchard text. A motion was made by Dr. Fairfax and seconded by Vice-Chair Peters.

Ms. Shankles stated that the Board should not vote on items unless they have been made available to the public for review and the information about the 46 replacement markers had not been made available to the public. Mr. Fisher stated that the public has a right to review the language of the proposed replacement markers prior to the Board's making a decision. Ms. Shankles stated that there was no notice because the 46 replacement markers were not on the agenda and the public was not provided with the information prior to the Board meeting. Director Langan commented that time was of the essence because the VDOT funding was only in place for two years. Ms. Kim asked if the Board could vote electronically. Mr. Fisher asked if the Board could have a conference call to vote. Ms. Shankles

responded that a quorum has to be present physically. After discussion by the Board about whether the text of the 46 replacement marker text was made available to the public with sufficient time for review, the Board decided to table the discussion and vote until later in the meeting.

EASEMENTS

Easement Amendment for Consideration

The following easement amendment was presented by Ms. Bearns for the Board's consideration.

1. Belgian Building, City of Richmond

Property Owner: Virginia Union University

Amendment to correct scrivener's error

The deed of easement conveyed in 2010 over the Belgian Building, owned by Virginia Union University (VUU), would be amended to correct an error in the recitals regarding two grants received for rehabilitation work. VUU received a Historically Black Colleges and Universities grant from the National Park Service to perform rehabilitation work on the Belgian Building and conveyance of the easement was a grant requirement. While the easement was being negotiated, VUU was also awarded a Save America's Treasures grant from the National Park Service (NPS), which also requires conveyance of an easement. The information regarding those two grants was conflated in the recitals of the deed of easement. The Easement Program was contacted by NPS regarding the error earlier this year as they are working to close out the Save America's Treasures grant. NPS has reviewed the deed of easement and it satisfies both grant requirements but NPS has asked that the error in the recitals be changed to correctly identify both grants and the amounts awarded under each grant. This will require only a change to the recitals; none of the restrictions or terms of the easement will be altered or affected. VUU has agreed to this change and understands that it is necessary in order for the Save America's Treasures grant money to be disbursed. Bearns confirmed that the changes would be made by DHR and the draft would be provided to VUU and NPS for their review and approval prior to execution and recordation. Ms. Bearns provided a copy of a draft motion for the Board's consideration.

Chairman Smith asked for confirmation that no other aspect of the easement would be modified. Bearns confirmed that only the recitals will be changed.

Chair Smith asked for a motion to amend the deed of easement for the Belgian Building to correct a scrivener's error, which was made by Ms. Kim. The motion was seconded by Dr. Atkins-Spivey and the motion was approved by the Board unanimously.

Easement Projects for Consideration

The following easement amendments were presented by Ms. Bearns for the Board's consideration.

Chairman Smith asked if the first two matters should be considered separately. Ms. Bearns responded that they would be presented separately and that staff were asking for separate motions as the matters are unrelated and in case any of the terms change in the future they can be addressed separately.

1. Water Street Meadow, Waterford Historic District, Loudoun County

Property Owner: Waterford Foundation

Post-facto approval of subdivision, water wells, and water lines

Subdivision:

The first matter was a request for post facto approval of a subdivision that occurred in 1992 in violation of the deed of easement gifted to the Board by the Waterford Foundation in 1972. Bearns explained that the Water Street Meadow is an open agricultural field within the Waterford Historic District and is considered a contributing resource to the district. The nomination is an older nomination written by Brown Morton and that he specifically took into consideration the village's unique history as a Quaker community with a clustered town with agricultural fields located in close proximity to the village. The Meadow is one of those agricultural fields and has never been improved. It remains in agricultural use today.

In 1992 a 0.5 acre parcel was conveyed to the owners of the Weaver's Cottage which is also subject to an easement held by the Board. The current owners of the Weaver's Cottage purchased the Cottage property and the 0.5 acres and were completely unaware of this issue. The property comprised two parcels when the easement was conveyed. Those parcel boundaries dated back many years and are still reflected in the County's GIS parcel data. One of the parcels was 0.5 acres and the Waterford Foundation apparently misunderstood that when the easement was conveyed it functioned as an overlay that erased the underlying property boundaries and treated the property as one parcel. The Department was not made aware of the subdivision until 2007 during a meeting with the Waterford Foundation and the Office of the Attorney General. The meeting was about various easement properties that the Foundation owns and possible amendments to strengthen the restrictions and standardize the language. The 0.5 acre parcel remains unimproved and staff were not aware of the 1992 conveyance as there was no change to the property. During discussions with the Waterford Foundation regarding amendment of the Water Street Meadow easement, staff recommended that the Foundation seek the Board's approval of this subdivision post facto. The long-term

plan, provided the Board approves of this, would be to separate the easement such that these two property owners are not bound together forever under one deed of easement. The deed of easement for the Water Street Meadow would be amended to reflect this change and strengthened as the Foundation has requested. And a separate deed of easement, carrying forward all of the restrictions in the current 1972 deed, would be drafted for the 0.5 acres. That separation and amendment will be brought to the Board for its review at a later date. The owners of the Weaver's Cottage and this 0.5 acres have had some health issues and we were unable to reach them to explain the matter and the proposal for many months. Ms. Bearns noted that she spoke with the owners on Monday morning and they understand the proposal and agreed along with the Waterford Foundation to request this post facto approval of the 1992 subdivision. Ms. Bearns provided a written draft motion for the Board's consideration.

Comments Summary:

Chair Smith asked for a motion for post facto approval of the subdivision of 0.5 acres from the Water Street Meadow in Waterford, Loudoun County, Virginia.

Mr. Fisher made a motion to approve of the request to amend as presented. The motion was seconded by Vice-Chair Peters. Chair Smith called for discussion.

Chair Smith inquired whether the owner of the 0.5 acres could build a garage or other accessory structure on that parcel. Ms. Bearns noted that the 0.5 acre parcel has always remained subject to the WSM easement even with the subdivision and that easement does not allow for any buildings or structures. The property can be used for open-space purposes only such as lawn, gardening, agriculture, etc. Vice-Chair Peters asked whether the 0.5 acres could be merged into the easement over the Weaver's Cottage so that the owner did not have two separate easements. Bearns stated that this was an interesting idea given that both easements are held by the Board. She did note that the WSM easement was rather unusual in its restrictions and those restrictions must be carried forward so it may not make sense to do that. Mr. Fisher asked whether, if the proposed amendment were approved, the owner of the Weaver's Cottage would have a portion of his property subject to the provisions of a separate (i.e. Water Street Meadow) easement, and whether it would be possible to merge the two easements. Ms. Bearns answered she had recently spoken with the owners of the Weaver's Cottage and that they may be amenable such a change. She stated that the concern would be that ultimately the Weaver's Cottage property would be subject to two different sets of restrictions, as the 0.5 acre parcel of the Water Street Meadow would remain separate and would still be mapped and taxed separately by Loudoun County. However, because the easements for the Water Street Meadow and the Weaver's Cottage were donated at the same approximate time and contain similar language, so it may be possible to merge the two easements.

Chair Smith called for further discussion. There being none, he asked for the vote. The Board voted unanimously to approve the motion.

Water Wells and Water Lines

The 1972 easement over the Water Street Meadow does not allow for the construction of any buildings or structures. It is also silent on the construction and installation of utilities, probably because without any buildings or structures there was no anticipated need for utilities. Waterford, despite its name, has had issues with water and wells running dry. Beginning around 1983 and continuing until 2009, water wells were installed on the Water Street Meadow property to serve other properties. There are four wells on the property; three serve other buildings in the Village and all of those buildings are subject to easements held by the Board. The fourth well was installed as a community well and was paid for by Loudoun County. It is not currently being used. During review of a plat prepared recently for the adjacent Hague-Hough House, a deed of easement for water lines to the community well was provided and that deed of easement was signed by the then DHR Director on behalf of the Board. It is unclear why the deed of easement for the water lines was signed but not the deed of easement for the well itself but it is clear that the Board and DHR were aware of and consented to the installation of the community well. The Department did not become aware of these other wells until the same meeting with the Waterford Foundation and the Office of the Attorney General in 2007. The Office of the Attorney General determined at that time that a well was a structure. In addition, it is a fundamental principle that easement properties enjoy special protections and should not be used as a beast of burden to serve other properties. The easement does not include any protection for archaeological resources. The Easement Program Archaeologist has reviewed the records and due to the absence of any improvements or history of use other than as an agricultural field and its location it has a very low potential for prehistoric or historic archaeological resources. The wells are already installed and three of them are actively serving properties which means that this matter affects public health and safety. In addition to the water lines associated with the wells, for which there are not separate easements, there is the easement for the water lines to the community well and a separate easement for water lines that was conveyed in 1996. It does not appear from the Health Department's records that the community well has been used or that the lines for that well were ever installed. The easement conveyed in 1996 was for water lines that connect one property whose well failed to another property with a functional well. Mr. Richard Storch acquired and rehabilitated multiple properties in the Village. And he owned two properties and while one was being rehabilitated the well ran dry. So he asked the Waterford Foundation for permission to install water lines across the Water Street Meadow, which was conveniently located and unimproved, to connect one house to the other. The easement is ten feet wide and the water lines were installed and are still being used. The Waterford Foundation would like to resolve this issue so that it can be properly included in the future amendment. Again, this is for post facto approval of the wells and the water lines. The amendment will be brought back to the Board separately in the future. A written draft motion was provided for the Board's consideration.

Comments Summary:

Chair Smith asked for a motion. Mr. Fisher made a motion to amend the WSM easement to approve of the four water wells and associated water lines installed on the Water Street Meadow between 1982 and 2009. Dr. Fairfax seconded the motion. Chair Smith called for discussion.

Chair Smith stated that the water issues in Waterford are significant and asked what would happen if other wells were to fail? Why shouldn't an open field be used to provide water? Ms. Bearns responded that water is an issue for the village and that the Waterford Foundation has tried to be helpful in the past by allowing these wells to be dug. Easement Program staff have been in discussions with the Foundation about this very issue and addressed it during a presentation made this past spring in Waterford in conjunction with Loudoun County. Water is absolutely necessary for the village and its residents but it needs to be addressed at the community level not on a property specific basis. Waterford had issues with failing septic systems and water contamination in the 1980s and the County worked with EPA to install a community sewer system. The village of St. Louis, a small traditionally African American village closer to Middleburg in Loudoun County, had similar water issues and they worked with the County to install a community water treatment facility. Waterford will need to do the same thing and address the issue at the community level and develop a sustainable solution. Continuing to dig wells on an easement property to serve other properties is not sustainable and not consistent with the purposes of an easement.

Chairman Smith called for any further discussion. There being none he asked for the vote. The Board voted unanimously to approve the motion as presented.

2. Walter Reed Birthplace, Gloucester County

Property Owner: Gloucester County Historical Society

Proposed utility easement for existing power line right-of-way

The easement over the Walter Reed Birthplace was recorded in 2012. The property includes a small vernacular frame dwelling that was the birthplace of Dr. Walter Reed, the conqueror of yellow fever and after whom Walter Reed Hospital in Bethesda, Maryland is named. The property was owned by Preservation Virginia and was transferred to the Gloucester Preservation Foundation in 2013 after the easement was recorded. The nomination was amended last fall to expand the boundaries to include additional acreage and to recognize Criterion D based on additional document research and archaeological investigations and Criterion A. The property was initially listed only under Criterion C. The title commitment provided when the easement was being negotiated did not note any exceptions but there is an overhead electrical utility line running parallel to Belroi Road on the property. Deed research on the adjacent property that is to be placed under easement revealed that the power line was previously located on the other side of Belroi Road but was likely relocated in the 1950s during a road straightening project. Dominion Power has agreed to record a deed of easement recognizing the existing 30 foot right-of-way. The deed of easement would include a provision allowing for the overhead line to be placed underground. The Foundation specifically requested an allowance for undergrounding to allow for removal of the power line as a modern intrusion into the landscape. Easement Program staff recommend that the undergrounding be subject to archaeological survey if warranted in the determination of staff, based on the location and method of installation. It is likely that the line would be undergrounded by directional boring which typically goes well below the cultural layers. Ms. Bearns explained that the language in the deed of easement allows for approval of new utilities provided they do not impair the conservation values and they serve the easement property. The overhead line does serve the Walter Reed Birthplace via an undergrounded service line. Ms. Bearns also noted that the Board has reviewed the conveyance of utility easements in the past and has been asked to make a determination as to whether the project constitutes conversion or diversion under Section 10.1-1704 of the Code of Virginia. This project does not require that determination as the easement was accepted with the overhead power line already in place. The recordation of the easement provides documentation in the title of what currently exists and the line itself provided actual notice of the encumbrance. There is no change to the use of the property under conversion and there will be no change to the protection of the conservation values or the dedicated conservation purpose of the property. This is also good example of why title work is helpful but also not always perfect and it is important for staff to be thorough in reviewing easement applications.

Staff recommend approval with two conditions. The first is that staff review the deed of easement and any plats or exhibits to be attached or recorded with the deed; the second is the requirement of archaeological survey if warranted based on the location and method of installation at the discretion of Easement staff. A written draft motion including the two conditions recommended by staff was provided for the Board's consideration.

Chairman Smith asked for a motion.

Comments Summary:

Mr. Fisher asked for clarification if the easement only allows one power line to run across the easement property. Ms. Bearns responded that a distribution line runs across the property which serves other properties, however the easement is drafted so that the overhead line cannot become larger. The 30' width of the utility easement limits the voltage and rate of the line that can be placed over the property. If a change in width of the right-of-way were proposed, it would be subject to the Section 1704 process as required by the Open-Space Land Act. Mr. Fisher also asked whether the distribution line would be placed under ground. Ms. Bearns stated that would be the preference of the Gloucester Historical Society, however because it is a small non-profit organization it may be difficult to raise funds for such an effort. Mr. Fisher encouraged the Gloucester Historical Society to negotiate with Dominion Power to have the lines placed under ground and to raise funds for such work.

Chair Smith asked for a motion. Ms. Peters made a motion to approve of the request to amend as presented. Mr. Fisher seconded the motion. Chair Smith called for any further discussion. There being none, he asked for the vote. The Board voted unanimously to approve the motion.

New Easement Offers for Consideration

Director Langan stated that she would not participate in the discussion on the first three easement offers presented to the Board for consideration, as she serves as an ex-officio officer on the Board of Trustees of the Shenandoah Valley Battlefield Foundation (SVBF).

The following new easement offers were presented by Ms. Musumeci for the Board's consideration.

1. West Woods Tract, Third Winchester (Opequon) Battlefield, Frederick County

Property Owner: Shenandoah Valley Battlefields Foundation ("SVBF")

Acreage: 26.28 acres

Located adjacent to I-81 northeast of Winchester, the 26-acre West Woods tract is comprised almost entirely of a mixed hardwood forest. From the south, the property slopes into the valley of a 1,200 foot long unnamed perennial stream, that is a tributary of Abrams Creek. This tract is the only remaining undeveloped land adjacent to a commercial and residential subdivision. It is bounded on the west by Interstate 81 (I-81), on the north by SVBF's Third Winchester Battlefield Park, on the east/northeast by a residential subdivision, on the south by a retail shopping center. This property lies within the core area of the Third Winchester (Opequon) Battlefield as determined by the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission ("CWSAC") which has given the battlefield a Preservation Priority IV.1, Class A rating. The property also lies within the study area of the Second Winchester Battlefield, which has a Preservation Priority Rating of IV.1 Class B from the CWSAC. The SVBF acquired the property in April 2016 and subsequently installed a pedestrian gravel-covered trail through the parcel, connecting the trail to other property owned by SVBF to the north. Acquisition by SVBF prevented the construction of a big box store that would have substantially degraded the integrity of the adjacent battlefield. The SVBF has applied for American Battlefield Protection Program ("ABPP"), Virginia Battlefield Preservation Fund ("VBPF"), and Virginia Land Conservation Foundation ("VLCF") grants for acquisition of the property.

Comments Summary:

Chair Smith asked whether staff has a recommendation on the proposed easement. Ms. Musumeci explained that additional information was provided by SVBF after the Easement Acceptance Committee ("EAC") meeting and that Easement Program staff feels comfortable with the answers provided by SVBF.

Chair Smith asked for a motion to approve the proposed easement. Mr. Fisher noted that while the issue with Interstate 81 was resolved, he was not certain that the issue with the other utility easements has been resolved. Ms. Musumeci noted that the gas line easement should be resolved because only one line was installed, and that SVBF was inquiring whether Washington Gas Company would vacate their other easements where no lines were ever installed. Mr. Fisher asked for clarification that SVBF does not yet have a response yet about vacation of these other easements. Ms. Musumeci confirmed SVBF does not yet have confirmation from the gas company. However the ten-year timeframe by which the rights for the gas and electric line easements should have been exercised has expired. The property currently contains one gas line at the north end and one waterline and one sewer line at the south end of the property..

Chair Smith called for a motion to approve the easement as presented.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Kim and the Board voted unanimously to approve the motion.

2. Crim Open-Space Parcel, New Market Battlefield, Shenandoah County

Property Owner: Shenandoah Valley Battlefields Foundation

Acreage: 1.25 acres

Located west of the intersection of North Congress Street and West Seminary Lane in the Town of New Market, the Crim Open-Space Parcel is comprised of one tax parcel containing 1.25 acres of open-space land. The property contains portions of a dry-laid stone wall, but is otherwise unimproved land in grass cover with a small section of mature deciduous trees. The property includes a 10-space paved parking area along its southern boundary, which is subject to a parking, utility, and access easement granted in 2012 to the benefit of an adjacent commercial parcel. SVBF acquired the property in conjunction with two adjacent residential parcels to the east in June 2016. Both ABPP and VBPF grants will be used to assist with acquisition costs for the 1.25 acre open-space parcel. SVBF would like to reserve the right to construct amenities such as walking trails, footpaths, parking facilities, kiosks, and signs, for interpretation of the property as a Civil War battlefield.

The property falls within the core area of the New Market Battlefield, which has a Preservation Priority Rating of IV.1 Class D from the CWSAC. Priority IV battlefields are those that are fragmented, and Class D battlefields are those "having a limited influence on the outcome of their campaign or operation but achieving or affecting important local objectives," in this case the Lynchburg Campaign from May to June 1864. On various maps of the battlefield, the main initial thrust of the Confederate force is shown moving north into combat

straddling the Valley Pike, which was the primary axis of the battle, engulfing the property and placing it between the battle lines as skirmishing began early on the morning of May 15, 1864. The town and the Crim property remained within the area of combat from the beginning of the battle at dawn until after noon when the Federals finally withdrew north of town. The property is also within the boundaries of the New Market Historic District, which was listed on the Virginia Landmarks Register (“VLR”) and National Register of Historic Places (“NRHP”) in 1972.

SVBF intends to incorporate the property into a pedestrian greenway trail which will provide a direct link between the Virginia Military Institute Hall of Valor Museum and the New Market Historic District, allowing visitors to follow the flow of the battle. Preservation of the property will also augment efforts to preserve historic properties in the Town of New Market as well as in Shenandoah County, including roughly 789 acres of land already subject to perpetual easements held by the Board.

The Easement Acceptance Committee recommends acceptance of the Crim Open-Space Parcel easement offer as presented, with no conditions for approval.

Comments Summary:

Following discussion by the Board about the existing parking spaces and access easement, Chair Smith asked for a motion to approve the easement as proposed. Mr. Fisher made the motion, which was seconded by Ms. Peters. The Board voted unanimously to approve the motion.

3. Crim House Tracts, New Market Battlefield, Shenandoah County

Property Owner: Shenandoah Valley Battlefields Foundation

Acreage: 0.69 acres

Located at the intersection of South Congress Street (also known as U.S. Route 11) and West Seminary Lane in the Town of New Market, the Crim House property contains two parcels of land totaling approximately 0.69 acres. The property is improved for residential use.

The Crim House is a two-story frame dwelling that has been designated a contributing resource to the New Market Historic District. This district was listed on the VLR and NRHP in 1972 for its architectural and historic significance as one of the best preserved linear-form towns that developed along the Valley Pike in Virginia. Also known as the Clinedinst House, the dwelling was built by Robert Long for John W. Clinedinst, who was the owner of a local carriage factory. The house is also significant for its association with Eliza Clinedinst Crim (John Clinedinst’s sister), known as “Mother Crim” for her efforts in caring for wounded Virginia Military Institute cadets after the 1864 Civil War Battle of New Market.

Constructed circa 1882, the dwelling is distinguished by its late Italianate-style architecture with Folk Victorian and Queen Anne influences. On the exterior, the building features a low pitched cross-gable roof with square cupola, decorative sawn ornamentation such as curvilinear bargeboards and flat scroll cut porch balusters, a one-story full length porch supported by boxed columns, tall narrow two-over-two double-hung windows with decorative hoods, a side bay window, and wide bracketed eaves.

Historic interior finishes are largely intact and incorporate plaster walls and ceilings, wood paneled doors with faux wood grain designs, a central wood staircase with heavy carved newel, three original marble mantles with fireboxes, five wood mantels, wood flooring, and original wood baseboards, trim, and chair rails. Several alterations to the building occurred in the 20th century.

Other buildings and structures located on the property include one workshop/garage with second level apartment constructed in 1990 and attached to an historic frame outbuilding, as well as one metal shed, a historic cistern, garden beds, and concrete hog trough.

The property is visible from North Congress Street, also known as U.S. Route 11 (formerly Valley Pike), Old Cross Road (VA Secondary Route 1002), West Seminary Lane, and U.S. Route 211, which streets are public transportation corridors and the easement requires physical public access to the property. The property’s open-space land contributes to the historic and cultural features that help to define the existing urban character and streetscape quality in the Town of New Market. The SVBF acquired the property in June 2016 as part of a larger transaction that included an adjoining open-space parcel to the west (rear). They intend to sell the two parcels with the house and residential improvements after conveying an easement on the property.

The Easement Acceptance Committee recommends acceptance of the Crim House Tracts easement offer as presented, with no conditions for approval.

Comments Summary:

Chair Smith asked for a motion to approve the easement offer as presented. Ms. Peters made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Fisher. Ms. Kim asked whether SVBF was going to sell the property. Ms. Musumeci answered that SVBF intended to place an easement on the property and then sell it. Chair Smith explained that the easement would protect the property before it is sold to another party. Chair Smith called for a vote. The Board voted unanimously to approve the offer as presented.

4. Chancellorsville Memorial Gardens Tract, Chancellorsville & Wilderness Battlefields, Spotsylvania County

Property Owner: Southern Dorchester, LLC; under contract to Civil War Trust
Acreage: 350 acres

Located between Plank Road (Route 3) and Orange Plank Road (State Route 621) in Spotsylvania County, the Chancellorsville Memorial Park tract contains approximately 350 acres of land. Comprised of two tax parcels, the unimproved property is primarily wooded cover in planted pine trees. The property lies almost entirely within the core area of the Chancellorsville Battlefield as determined by the CWSAC, which has given the battlefield a Preservation Priority I.2 Class A rating. The CWSAC classifies Priority I battlefields as those “with a critical need for action” and further defines Class A battlefields as those “having a decisive influence on a campaign and a direct impact on the course of the war.” The Battle of Chancellorsville was the final battle of the April-May 1863 Chancellorsville Campaign. On May 2, 1863 Confederate General Stonewall Jackson mounted a surprise attack against the Federal left flank, marching his cavalry onto and across the property to strike Union General Otis O. Howard’s XI Corps.

The property also lies within the core and study area of the Wilderness Battlefield as determined by the CWSAC, and has the same priority rating. This battle was part of Union Gen. Ulysses S. Grant’s Overland Campaign from May through June 1864. At dawn on May 6, 1864, Union Maj. Gen. Winfield Hancock’s II Corps attacked along the Plank Road, and onto the Property. Historic maps indicate that the property was wooded at the time of the battles of Chancellorsville and Wilderness. Aerial images and topographic maps dating back to 1887 do not show the presence of any buildings or structures on the property, but do indicate the property was timbered in the early 1960s and again in the mid to late 1990s. This documentation also suggests that the property was historically wooded and was replanted in pine circa 2000 after the last timber harvest. Today the property is comprised primarily of young pine stands with a few areas of field and mixed tree and brushy growth.

Portions of the property are visible from Plank Road (Route 3) and Orange Plank Road (State Route 621), public rights-of-way. The property also shares some of its boundaries with the adjacent Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park. Conservation of this tract will augment 1,038 acres of land subject to perpetual easements held by the Board in Spotsylvania County. Other conservation values include over 12,000 linear feet of lake, pond, and stream frontage including a portion of Lewis Run. A residential subdivision known as Six Lakes West adjoins the property along its southeastern boundary. Encumbrances on the property include a 75’ wide easement around lake in adjacent Six Lakes West Subdivision, which permits residents of subdivision to access the lake for passive recreational purposes.

In December 2015, the CWT signed a contract to purchase the property, which was listed on the market for sale with conceptual plans for large residential lot development. The CWT has applied for ABPP and VBPF grants to fund acquisition of the property. They would like to reserve the right to construct amenities such as walking trails, parking facilities, and signs for interpretation of the property as a Civil War battlefield. Acquisition by CWT will protect the property from planned development and provide for interpretation of two historically significant battles that occurred on the same parcel of land.

The Easement Acceptance Committee recommends acceptance of the Chancellorsville Memorial Garden Tract easement offer as presented, subject to the following conditions:

1. The deed of easement shall include language to address forest management including timbering, replanting, landscape restoration and land conversion consistent with the current standard template.
2. The deed of easement shall include indemnification and hold harmless language for any claims or causes of action related to the rights of third parties to the use of the manmade lake previously conveyed and recorded in the land records.

Comments Summary:

Chair Smith asked whether CWT would be allowed to cut trees on the property. Ms. Musumeci stated that the standard easement provisions for properties with 20 or more acres of forested cover would allow for timber harvest, provided that a forest management plan and timber harvest plan were in place and archaeology had been conducted prior to the harvest. Often battlefield organizations want to restore the landscape to its historic appearance, and the easement language would also allow for that restoration to occur. Ms. Bearns noted that the pine planted for commercial purposes has an artificial appearance, and that the easement would allow for harvest of the pine and natural regrowth and that easement staff would work with CWT to incorporate archaeological survey into the harvest plan. Chair Smith inquired whether the lake could be used by the adjacent residential subdivision forever. Ms. Bearns confirmed that, and stated that easement staff would contact the county engineer to see whether that right could be eliminated as the lake is currently dry and will ultimately fail. Chair Smith asked how long the lake has been dry. Ms. Musumeci answered that she was not certain, but that aerial maps from 2012 show it becoming dry.

Chair Smith made a motion to approve the easement offer for the Chancellorsville Memorial Gardens Tract as presented. The motion was seconded by Dr. Atkins-Spivey and the Board voted unanimously to approve the motion.

5. Lestella Roberts Tract, White Oak Road Battlefield, Dinwiddie County

Property Owner: Estate of Lestella D. Roberts; under contract to Civil War Trust
Acreage: 12.28 acres

Located just south of White Oak Road (State Route 613) in Dinwiddie County, the Lestella Roberts Tract encompasses approximately 12 acres of land. Comprised of densely wooded cover, the property is unimproved with a level to gently rolling topography. The property lies within the core area of the White Oak Road Battlefield, which has a Preservation Priority Rating of I.3 Class B. This battle was part of the Appomattox Campaign from March to April 1865. On March 30, 1865 Confederate General Robert E. Lee shifted reinforcements to meet the Federal movement to turn his right flank and set up an entrenched defensive line. Union Major General Warren pushed the troops of his V Corp as close to the White Oak Road defensive line as possible and then also entrenched a line. On March 31, Warren directed his corps against the Confederate entrenchments along White Oak Road. The Union advance was stalled by a Confederate counterattack, but Warren's position stabilized. This fighting set up the Confederate defeat at Five Forks on April 1.

The property lies within the study area of Five Forks Battlefield, which has a Preservation Priority Rating of III.1 Class A. Priority III battlefields are those needing some additional protection. This battle was also part of the Appomattox Campaign. In the spring of 1865, Grant ordered Union Major General Philip Sheridan and his cavalry to advance on the South Side railroad by way of an important junction known as Five Forks. Lee countered this move by ordering Major General George Pickett with his infantry division and cavalry to hold the vital crossroads "at all hazards." After briefly stalling the Union advance on March 31, Pickett withdrew his command to Five Forks and fortified his position. The next day the Union V Corps assaulted the Confederate left flank and rear, turning their position and taking many prisoners. This Union victory heralded the end of the stalemate outside Petersburg and set the stage for the battle that followed the next day.

The property also lies within the study area of The Breakthrough/Petersburg III Battlefield, which has a Preservation Priority Rating of I.1 Class A and was also part of the 1865 Appomattox Campaign. General Ulysses S. Grant ordered all his corps south of the Appomattox River to charge on the morning of April 2, 1865, hoping that General Robert E. Lee's measures to restore the lost ground at Five Forks would render the southern breastworks vulnerable. The Federals quickly overran the enemy pickets, but for 15 minutes they endured an intense fire of small arms and artillery. The surviving troops tore apart multiple lines of field fortifications, continued forward, and scaled the breastworks. In the end the VI Corps Breakthrough proved to be the decisive battle of the Petersburg Campaign.

The CWT recently executed a purchase and sale agreement to acquire the property, with closing expected to occur by June 2017. There is no access to the site and the parcel is separated from the road by a sliver of land owned by the CWT to the north. The property is adjacent to land owned by CWT along its northern and eastern boundaries and is in close proximity to the 647 acre Riveroak Tract, subject to an easement held by the Board. Preservation of the property will augment 1,038 acres of land subject to easements held by the Board in Dinwiddie County and the City of Petersburg.

To assist with acquisition costs, the CWT has applied for ABPP and VBPF grants. The CWT would like to reserve the right to construct amenities such as walking trails, footpaths, parking facilities, kiosks, and signs, for interpretation of the property as a Civil War Battlefield.

The Easement Acceptance Committee recommends acceptance of the Lestella Roberts Tract easement offer as presented, subject to the following conditions:

1. An updated plat of boundary survey shall be completed prior to recordation of the deed of easement or the discrepancy in the plat of survey is resolved.
2. The Civil War Trust shall convey an access easement over the adjacent parcel to the north for the benefit of the Lestella Roberts Tract. The easement must be perpetual, run with the land, and be approximately 20 feet in width.

Comments Summary:

Chair Smith asked about the discrepancy in acreage between the title commitment and the property description. Ms. Musumeci explained that the title commitment lists 12.28 acres but the plat of survey identifies 12.31 acres, and that the title commitment may be incorrect due to confusion at the time the property was divided into five parcels. Chair Smith asked whether easement program staff would work to resolve the acreage, and whether a property survey is typically done by CWT when they acquire a property. Adam Gillenwater of the Civil War Trust answered that he believed a survey is done at the time of acquisition of the property. Ms. Musumeci said that generally a survey is conducted, and that the cost of the survey can be covered by grant funding.

Chair Smith made a motion that the easement offer for the Lestella Roberts Tract on White Oak Road Battlefield in Dinwiddie County be approved as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kim and the Board voted unanimously to approve the motion.

6. Jenkins Tract/Hansbrough Ridge, Brandy Station Battlefield, Culpeper County

Property Owner: Civil War Trust

Acreage: 174 acres

Located two miles east of the village of Stevensburg and north of Virginia Route 3 (Germanna Highway) in Culpeper County, the Jenkins Tract contains two parcels totaling approximately 174 acres of land. Comprised primarily of open space land with approximately 35 acres of wooded cover, the property is unimproved. This tract is notable for its unique topographical feature known as "The Ridge" or

“Hansbrough’s” that runs in a north-south direction and ranges in height from 400 to 450 feet. With the exception of the 35 acres of wooded cover, the remaining land was subjected to a timber harvest in 2015.

The Jenkins Tract falls within partially within the core and study areas of the Brandy Station Battlefield which has a Preservation Priority I.3, Class B rating from the CWSAC. At the onset of the battle on June 9, 1863, Union cavalry under the command of Major General Joseph Hooker crossed the Rappahannock River and attacked Major General J.E.B. Stuart's cavalry and several Confederate foot brigades at the base of Fleetwood Hill. During the Stevensburg phase of the battle, which occurred south of the action at Fleetwood Hill, Union Colonel Alfred Duffie led the II Cavalry Division towards Stevensburg. Confederate Colonel Mathew Butler and his 2nd SC Cavalry attempted to defend the road toward Culpeper and initially placed one squadron on Hansbrough’s Ridge. Butler then rushed forward a detachment of troops that formed a line along the eastern crest of Hansbrough’s ridge. The presence of the dismounted line, reinforced later by the 4th Virginia Cavalry delayed Duffie’s already slow advance. However, Duffie’s troops pushed onto and charged over the ridge and down the road with devastating effect. Successive commanders utilized the ridge as an artillery platform, and cavalry battles swayed back and forth on Hansbrough’s western ridge.

The property is also almost entirely within the Hansborough Ridge Winter Encampment District, which was listed on the VLR and NRHP in 1992 under Criterion A (Significant Event) and Criterion D (Information Potential). During the winter of 1863-1864, 20,000 soldiers of the Army of the Potomac’s II Corps moved into the Stevensburg area, with the bulk of this command camped for five months atop Cole’s Hill and Hansborough’s Ridge.

A portion of the property is visible from State Route 3 (Germanna Highway), a public right-of-way. It is situated across Route 3 from Salubria, subject to an easement held by the Board. Preservation of the Jenkins Tract will augment efforts to preserve battlefield properties in Culpeper County, including roughly 4,528 acres of land already subject to perpetual easements held by the Board. The CWT acquired the tract in July 2016 and subsequently contracted with Rivanna Archaeological Associates to conduct an archaeological assessment of portions of the property. They have applied for an ABPP grant to fund acquisition of the property and would like to reserve the right to construct amenities such as walking trails, parking facilities, and signs for interpretation of the property as a Civil War battlefield.

Per the recommendation of the EAC, CWT recently contracted with Rivanna Archaeological Associates to conduct an archaeological assessment on portions of the property. As part of the scope of work, the intact portion of the encampment was mapped and documented. The remainder of property was subjected to targeted assessment, with areas determined most likely to contain evidence of human use/occupation subjected to Phase I investigation. The Archaeological assessment was conducted in September 2016 and DHR was provided with a Management Summary by Rivanna on September 13, 2016.

The Easement Acceptance Committee recommends acceptance of the Jenkins Tract/Hansborough Ridge easement offer as presented, subject to the following conditions:

1. Per the results of the Phase I archaeological survey conducted by Rivanna Archaeological Associates and DHR’s review of the associated report(s), DHR and CWT jointly negotiate a Landscape Management Plan to address the timbered areas of the property and future interpretation plans, which shall be incorporated into the deed of easement either directly or by reference.
2. The deed of easement shall include language to address forest management including timbering, replanting, landscape restoration and land conversion consistent with the current standard template,
3. Based on staff’s review of the Management Summary provided by Rivanna, staff recommends that the Land Management Plan identified in #1 above, also include reasonable measures to protect the archaeological resources that have been exposed or made accessible/vulnerable as a result of the timbering. Such measures may include, but should not be limited to:
 - A. No trespassing signs and blazing in accordance with the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries (DGIF) requirements;
 - B. Access restriction measures (gates, chaining, etc.) at all vehicle access points;
 - C. Notifying local law enforcement of the location and concerns;
 - D. Developing a network of local volunteers willing to periodically patrol the property.

Ms. Musumeci stated that staff was also recommending that implementation of 3A through 3B above take place within 60 calendar days from the date of Board meeting.

Comments Summary:

Ms. Joanna Green, Easement Program Archaeologist, reviewed the results from the archaeological investigation of the property by Rivanna Archaeological Associates and stated that portions of the encampment remain intact, with some damage due to relic hunting on the property. The road patterns, hut features, fire boxes and perimeter walls of the defensive features are all legible and the site is very significant from both an archaeological and historical perspective. Chair Smith asked whether this part of the property was harvested. Ms. Green responded that this portion of the property was specifically excluded from the timbering due to the significant features discussed. Ms. Musumeci and Ms. Green reviewed recent photos illustrating the features found on the property, including fireboxes and the remnants of the hut platforms, which conform to the designs specified by the War Department.

Ms. Musumeci discussed relic hunting in general and recent internet discussions concerning this property in particular. The timber harvest has made the area on the top of the ridge vulnerable, and the archaeological community and easement program staff is concerned about ongoing relic hunting. Chair Smith asked whether measures to address this problem are successful. Ms. Green stated that the proposed measures are better than no measures and Ms. Bearns stated that while the property is visible, signs of presence by CWT as property owner will help to dissuade relic hunting. Vice-Chair Peters asked whether DHR is allowed to protect information according to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), noting that people who know how to read topographical maps and meeting minutes will be able to identify the property. Ms. Bearns responded that information can be protected, as FOIA has protections for sensitive sites; however, this property is identified on the Digging in Virginia website, so the property is well known. So too, the National Park Service makes the battlefield boundaries available online, so a sophisticated member of the public could do research to find sensitive sites. Ms. Bearns also noted that easement program staff has withdrawn data on sensitive easement properties and provides only an approximate location and acres protected to aggregators of information on conserved lands.

Chair Smith called for a motion that the easement offer for the Jenkins Tract/Hansborough Ridge, Brandy Station Battlefield, Culpeper County be approved as presented. Ms. Kim made the motion, which was seconded by Mr. Fisher. The Board voted unanimously to approve the motion.

7. Stock Tract, Brandy Station Battlefield, Culpeper County

Property Owner: Jeremy S. Stock

Acreage: 70 acres

Located on Farley Road roughly four miles north of Brandy Station in Culpeper County, the Stock Tract contains one 70-acre parcel of land. The property is historically part of the larger Brandy Rock Farm and is used for both residential and agricultural purposes. The property lies within the core area of the Brandy Station Battlefield, which has a Preservation Priority Rating of 1.3 Class B from the CWSAC. Situated at the northern terminus of Fleetwood Hill, the property contains the location where Confederate Gen. W.H.F. Rooney Lee positioned his initial line west of Farley Road on June 9, 1863. One regiment—the 13th VA—anchored the far left and connected on the right with Lee’s three remaining regiments. Roughly 10 acres of the property are in crop production, 35-40 acres are wooded (but not used for timbering purposes), and approximately 20 acres are open, mowed field. The parcel also contains 340 feet of streams that feed into the Hazel River. Existing buildings and structures located on the property include: one 1.5-story circa 1936 dwelling, two greenhouses, an in-ground pool with patio, frame bathhouse, carport/picnic shelter, enclosed garden, tennis court with fence, metal storage shed, and two equipment sheds. The 1.5 story multi-bay English cottage style dwelling on the property was constructed in 1936 for Lewis Strauss and his wife. Built by unemployed local workers, the foundation and structural system are composed of rough cut stone found on the property. Other distinguishing features include a gable roof covered in slate, several rough-cut stone chimneys, hipped roofed dormers on all four elevations, original wood windows, and an enclosed porch located within a central courtyard. Lewis Strauss was an investment banker significant for his role in shaping U.S. nuclear policy, serving as a member of the first Atomic Energy Commission in 1946 and as Chairman of the Commission in 1953 for a 5-year term. He died at home on Brandy Rock Farm in 1974. The property has not been listed on the VLR/NRHP nor formally evaluated for eligibility for listing by DHR. However, the property was the subject of a 2008 Cost-Share Survey project completed by a cultural resource management firm, which recommended the property would be potentially eligible under:

- Criterion A: direction association with Depression-era economics
- Criterion B: association with Lewis Strauss
- Criterion C: unique architectural form

The property is visible from Farley Road, a public right-of-way and is within the Journey Through Hallowed Ground National Heritage Area. Conservation of this tract will augment 4,970 acres of land subject to perpetual easements held by the Board in Culpeper County.

The CWT is working with the property owner to place a conservation easement on the property. CWT intends to fully purchase the value of the easement over the property and has applied for ABPP and VBPF grants to fund the purchase.

The Easement Acceptance Committee recommends acceptance of the Stock Tract easement offer as presented, subject to the following conditions:

1. The main house and any associated outbuildings determined by DHR to have historic significance be recognized and appropriately treated and protected consistent with the restrictions developed for architectural resources in the deed of easement.
2. Reservation allowing the Easement Acceptance Committee and DHR’s Easement Program staff to recommend and incorporate into the deed of easement language addressing future management of the property and its historic resources, including the historic battlefield, consistent with standard provisions in the current easement templates and adopted Board policies.

Comments Summary:

Chair Smith asked whether CWT was purchasing the property. Ms. Musumeci answered that CWT was purchasing an easement on the property. Ms. Musumeci invited Adam Gillenwater to speak on behalf of CWT. Mr. Gillenwater said that CWT has concerns about the provisions as proposed, not because they oppose preservation of the house or historic outbuildings, but because of the desire to complete the easement by the end of 2016. CWT hopes to preserve the open space as a battlefield landscape this year so that the owner can take

advantage of certain tax benefits, and if that is not possible the deal would go away. The property owner has requested that the provision requiring protection of the historic house and associated outbuildings be eliminated. CWT and the property owner are open to working with the Board and easement program staff on a separate easement to protect the buildings, and noted that the property owner has made a major concession in agreeing to provisions that would restrict the ability to construct additional buildings on the property. Chair Smith confirmed that CWT was requesting an easement on seventy acres to protect the open space, but not the house. Mr. Gillenwater responded that they request that the provision addressing the house and outbuildings be removed, or split the property into two easements – one to protect the open space and a separate easement at a later date to protect the historic house and outbuildings. Ms. Musumeci stated that an easement could be drafted to protect the battlefield which would recognize the buildings and structures, but that would not have restrictions for their protection. A later overlay easement could be recorded that would protect the historically significant architectural resources. Chair Smith stated that he understood that the battlefield is significant, but also that staff feels strongly that the 1936 house should be protected. In response to a question from Ms. Shankles, Mr. Gillenwater stated that CWT and the owner would accept an easement on the land but not on the house and outbuildings. Mr. Fisher stated that CWT was offering an easement on the battlefield land, and Mr. Gillenwater responded that CWT would purchase an easement on the property without provisions on the house and outbuildings so that the owner could realize tax benefits in 2016. Dr. Atkins-Spivey asked why provisions to protect the house and outbuildings would cause the easement process to extend beyond 2016. Ms. Musumeci responded that easement program staff has had no contact or discussions with the property owner and that it is unrealistic that an easement over this property could be recorded by the end of December 2016. Dr. Atkins-Spivey asked whether this has been explained to the owner. Mr. Gillenwater responded that the owner was made aware, but that CWT and the owner were trying to preserve the battlefield if possible. Ms. Kim asked if the proposed language is not acceptable, what would be acceptable to the property owner. Ms. Musumeci stated that the owner just wants to preserve the open-space battlefield with an easement that does not apply to the buildings and that would not include provisions requiring maintenance of the buildings or review and approval for changes to the buildings. Furthermore, the recommendation by the EAC and staff that the buildings should be protected was based on the 2008 cost-share survey; staff has not visited the property yet and does not know whether other buildings are present that would merit protection. Easement program staff did not understand the impetus for closing in 2016 if neither the state level land preservation tax credit or the federal income tax deduction were sought because the easement was to be fully purchased by CWT.

Chair Smith noted that often non-historic resources are removed from properties owned by CWT and preserved through an easement, such that the property begins to appear as it would have in the 1860s, but there are properties with significant historic resources that date later than the Civil War, and asked what CWT does in those cases. Mr. Gillenwater clarified that in this case CWT would purchase the easement and not purchase the property in fee-simple. The property owner has recently rehabilitated the house and has no plans to demolish the buildings. Chair Smith followed by asking whether an easement on the land could be recorded and then an easement on the house. Ms. Musumeci said that a second easement to protect the buildings would be risky because there is no guarantee that it would be executed. Ms. Shankles asked for clarification as to whether the discussion was about an easement on only the battlefield, and Ms. Musumeci explained that the entire property is within the battlefield. Mr. Fisher stated that the offer is unusual, and that CWT would purchase an easement to protect the battlefield. Mr. Fisher observed that while the Board and staff feel that the architecture should be protected, the owner is willing to negotiate an easement on the buildings next year, and that at least the battlefield would be protected in 2016 and nothing could be built under the provisions acceptable to CWT and the owner.

Mr. Fisher made a motion to approve the easement to protect the entire property as a battlefield and to not include provisions to protect the 1936 house, and leave that to later negotiations. Ms. Kim seconded the motion.

Ms. Musumeci stated that other easement projects also have historic resources that post-date the Civil War battle, which are protected. While this offer is unusual as it would continue to be privately owned, the mission of the easement program and policy of the Board is to comprehensively protect all historic resources present. Mr. Fisher noted the policy against taking an easement that does not protect all historic resources, and suggested following Ms. Shankles idea of protecting the unimproved portion of the battlefield. Chair Smith responded that the Board would not get all that it wanted, but would get an easement on most of the property. Mr. Fisher stated that scenario would allow for changes to the portion of the property that is not under easement such as construction of a high-rise building, whereas an easement that covers the whole property would not allow for such construction, even if it did not protect the existing house. Ms. Musumeci confirmed that the Board is not under any obligation to accept the recommendation by staff, nor the offer from CWT and the property owner. Chair Smith asked if there was any further discussion of the motion made by Mr. Fisher. Vice-Chair Peters asked whether the owner would be willing to accept provisions for the retention of the existing buildings, and Mr. Gillenwater confirmed that would be acceptable. Vice-Chair Peters noted that the property owner receives something for granting the easement and expressed concern that the property owner is holding the Board hostage due to their tax concerns. With provisions for the retention of the buildings, she could support Mr. Fisher's motion, despite serious concerns about the process and the feeling that the Board is held hostage to the owners' personal needs, which are outside of the Board's responsibility to act in the best interests of the Commonwealth. Dr. Atkins-Spivey stated that easement program staff seems wary of no protection for the buildings, which goes against the program policy and precedent with other properties. Ms. Musumeci reiterated the mission and policy of the program to comprehensively protect historic resources on a property, and that staff had similar conversations with SVBF about the Crim House, but that DHR has not had similar conversations with the owners of the Stock Tract. Chair Smith said the owner has a lot of motivation for donation of an easement due to the tax benefits associated with the benefit.

Chair Smith called for a vote on Mr. Fisher's motion, which, at Ms. Musumeci's request, Ms. Tune read aloud to the Board. Mr. Fisher clarified that his motion would not address any of the buildings on the property. Chair Smith again called for a vote. Chair Smith, Mr.

Fisher, and Ms. Kim voted in the affirmative. Vice-Chair Peters and Dr. Atkins-Spivey voted against the motion, and Dr. Fairfax abstained. Chair Smith asked Ms. Shankles whether the motion passed based on the Board's bylaws.

Dr. Fairfax noted that it was her first Board meeting, but that she was concerned because easement program staff did not have anything in writing from the property owners as to their future intent and that the Board was asked to make a decision based on what was told to a third party. While she was not suggesting any impropriety, she agreed with Vice-Chair Peters' that the Board was being asked to vote without benefit of all information. She did not know what occurred in the past, but the proposal seemed haphazard and if the Board agrees to no protections for the historic buildings, the Board agrees to future situations where other property owners want similar exceptions. The request by CWT and the property owners holds the Board hostage to personal matters. Ms. Shankles confirmed that the majority of Board members must vote in the affirmative in order for a motion to pass, and therefore the motion was not approved with only three votes in the affirmative.

Dr. Atkins-Spivey asked whether the Board could defer a vote, although that would put the deal in a precarious situation. Chair Smith stated his belief that the project would not go away at the end of the year and he would be comfortable with deferring a decision. Mr. Fisher then made a motion to protect the entire battlefield property with restrictions on demolition of the existing buildings that staff feels are historically significant. Ms. Musumeci clarified that Mr. Fisher's second motion would preclude willful demolition of the buildings, whereas his first motion did not address the existing buildings at all. Ms. Kim seconded the motion, and explained her belief that it is important to preserve the battlefield land. The Board may not get all that it wants, but it would preserve 70 acres of battlefield lands.

Chair Smith called for a vote. Mr. Fisher, Ms. Kim, Vice-Chair Peters, and Chair Smith voted in the affirmative. Dr. Atkins-Spivey and Dr. Fairfax voted in the negative. Chair Smith stated that the motion was approved with four votes.

Easement Offers for Reconsideration

The following easement offers for reconsideration were presented by Ms. Musumeci.

1. Yeates Tract, Second Manassas Battlefield, Prince William County

Property Owner: Civil War Trust

Acreage: 2.58

Comprised of a mixture of mature deciduous hardwood trees, ornamental plantings, and grass lawn, the 2.58 acre property is currently improved for residential use. The tract fronts General Longstreets Line, a private gravel road running through the surrounding Zouave Hills residential subdivision near Manassas. Existing buildings and structures include: one dwelling with attached wood deck, patios, and two brick pathways; one detached frame carport; two brick pillars at entry to driveway; one metal culvert; and other residential improvements.

The Board initially reviewed and approved the easement offer for the Yeates Tract at its June 19, 2014 meeting, subject to the following conditions:

1. The lease period for the existing residential dwelling does not exceed the 2-year time frame negotiated by the CWT and any change to the 2-year lease period shall be negotiated in advance with the DHR.
2. Demolition or removal of existing buildings and structures and rehabilitation or restoration of the landscape shall be completed within within 3-years of the date of easement recordation; any change to the 3-year time frame for demolition or removal of existing buildings and structures as determined by the Board shall be negotiated in advance with the DHR.
3. Demolition or removal of existing buildings and structures shall be conducted according to a written management plan negotiated jointly by the CWT and the DHR, and such plan shall be incorporated into the easement either directly or by reference.

Per the request of the property owner, CWT subsequently asked to extend the holdover occupancy or leaseback period for the residential improvements from 2 years to 3 years and the demolition time period for existing non-historic buildings and structures to 4 years. On December 11, 2014 the Board approved extension of the lease period from 2 to 3 years, subject to the following:

1. The demolition period shall remain at 3 years from the date of expiration of the lease or termination of the lease agreement.
2. All other conditions of the Board's approval from its June 19, 2014 meeting shall remain in effect.

CWT acquired the property on July 6, 2016. Per the request of the current tenants and former property owners, CWT has asked to extend the lease period for 1 additional year—for a total of 4 years. Per legal review of title work and associated encumbrances, this property does not have access to a public road, which was verified with Prince William County. All of the roads providing access are privately owned and maintained by the Zouave Hills Road Association. Additionally, the property is subject to the Zouave Hills Road Association agreement and the deed of conservation easement will need to include indemnification language.

The Easement Acceptance Committee recommends acceptance of the Yeates Tract easement offer as presented, subject to the following revised conditions for approval:

1. The existing residential lease may not exceed four (4) years from September 2016 date of execution, and the property shall not be leased or rented following the termination or expiration of the existing lease, whichever occurs first.
2. The demolition and/or removal of the existing non-historic buildings and structures and rehabilitation of the landscape shall be completed within three (3) calendar years of the date of expiration of the lease or termination of the lease, whichever occurs first. Prior to recordation, any change to the timeframe for demolition or removal of the existing non-historic buildings and structures shall be negotiated in advance with DHR.
3. Demolition and removal of the existing non-historic buildings and structures shall be subject to a written management plan to be negotiated jointly by CWT and DHR and such plan shall be incorporated directly or by reference into the deed of easement.
4. The deed of easement shall include indemnification and hold harmless language for any claims or causes of action and for any and all costs, fines and fees arising from or associated with the Zouave Hills Road Association and the private roads owned and maintained by such Association.
5. The deed of easement shall include language granting to the Board and DHR rights of access to the property over those private roads such that the Board and DHR shall enjoy the same rights as the property owner.

Comments Summary:

Mr. Fisher made a motion to approve the revised easement offer as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kim and the Board voted unanimously to approve the motion.

2. Wotring Tract, Second Manassas Battlefield, Prince William County

Property Owner: Civil War Trust

Acreage: 2.99

Comprised of a mixture of mature deciduous hardwood trees, ornamental plantings, and grass lawn, the 2.99 acre property is currently improved for residential purposes. The tract fronts General Longstreet's Line and General Warren Avenue, which are private gravel roads running through the surrounding Zouave Hills residential subdivision in Manassas. Existing buildings, structures, and amenities include: one single-family brick dwelling with an attached garage and rear deck, two gazebos, one stable/workshop, one enclosed garden, one metal ornamental bird bath and feeder, one rock walled garden, two asphalt pads, one gravel pad overlaid with astroturf, one metal pump jack, cast iron and wood post fencing, and other residential improvements.

The Board approved the easement offer for the Wotring Tract at its March 21, 2013 meeting, subject to the following:

1. The life tenant(s) shall be included as a party to the easement.
2. The required demolition of extant non-historic buildings and structures and rehabilitation of the landscape shall be completed within one (1) calendar year following expiration of the life tenancy or vacancy of the property, whichever comes first.
3. The demolition and rehabilitation shall be conducted according to a written management plan that shall be negotiated jointly by the CWT and DHR, and such plan shall be incorporated into the easement, either directly or by reference.

Because three years had passed since the Board's initial approval, the Wotring Tract easement offer was reconsidered and reapproved by the Board with the conditions above on March 17, 2016. The CWT acquired the property in 2013 subject to a life estate. One of the life tenants passed away in October 2015. There is a gap in the chain of title where title to the property was never conveyed to the remaining life tenant. In addition, per legal review of title work and associated encumbrances, this property does not have access to a public road, which was verified with Prince William County. All of the roads providing access are privately owned and maintained by the Zouave Hills Road Association. The property is also subject to the Zouave Hills Road Association agreement.

The Easement Acceptance Committee recommends acceptance of the Wotring Tract easement offer as presented, subject to the following conditions:

1. The demolition and/or removal of the existing non-historic buildings and structures and rehabilitation of the landscape shall be completed within one (1) calendar year of the expiration or termination of the life estate, whichever occurs first.
2. Prior to recordation, any change to the timeframe for demolition or removal of the existing non-historic buildings and structures shall be negotiated in advance with DHR.
3. Demolition and removal of the existing non-historic buildings and structures shall be subject to a written management plan to be negotiated jointly by CWT and DHR and such plan shall be incorporated directly or by reference into the deed of easement.
4. The deed of easement shall include indemnification and hold harmless language for any claims or causes of action and for any and all costs, fines and fees arising from or associated with the Zouave Hills Road Association and the private roads owned and maintained by such Association.
5. The deed of easement shall include language granting to the Board and DHR rights of access to the property over those private roads such that the Board and DHR shall enjoy the same rights as the property owner.
6. The Civil War Trust shall provide title insurance for the Board's interest through the deed of easement in the property.

Comments Summary:

Chair Smith inquired whether somebody is still living in the property and why the life tenancy was not correct. Ms. Musumeci said there was a gap in the chain of title where one of the life tenants had not transferred title to the property to the remaining life tenant. Ms. Musumeci said that the Board is not being asked to approve the life tenant's ability to remain on the property, but that CWT would obtain

title insurance that would insure the Board's interest in the property because of the gap in the chain of title. Ms. Shankles asked whether the life tenant was not granted a life tenancy, and Ms. Musumeci clarified that both life tenants were listed on the deed of transfer to CWT.

Chair Smith made a motion to approve the revised easement offer as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Fisher and the Board voted unanimously to approve the motion.

3. Gibson Tract, Second Manassas Battlefield, Prince William County

Property Owner: Civil War Trust

Acreage: 3.16

Comprised of primarily wooded cover with some areas of open lawn, the 3.16-acre Gibson property is currently improved for residential purposes. The tract fronts Groveton Road, which is a public right of way, and shares a portion of its eastern boundary with General Longstreets Line, which is a private gravel road running through the surrounding Zouave Hills residential subdivision. Existing improvements include: one wood-frame two-story dwelling (1986) with an attached two-car garage; concrete patio and stamped-concrete walkway; one detached wood-frame garage/workshop; one wood-frame child's playhouse; one wood-frame jungle gym; one trampoline; one rock fire pit; one masonry barbecue, one asphalt driveway with poured-concrete parking pad; two concrete pillars and other residential improvements. The CWT acquired the property in 2013. ;

The Board approved the easement offer for the Gibson Tract at its March 21, 2013 meeting, subject to the following:

1. The relocation and/or removal of the modern house and garage on the property and rehabilitation of the landscape shall be completed within three (3) calendar years following the date of recordation of the easement.
2. Demolition or removal of existing non-historic buildings and structures and rehabilitation of the landscape shall be conducted according to a written management plan that shall be negotiated jointly by the Civil War Trust and DHR, and such plan shall be incorporated into the easement, either directly or by reference.

Because three years had passed since the Board's initial approval, the Wotring Tract easement offer was reconsidered and reapproved by the Board with the conditions above on March 17, 2016. However, per legal review of title work and associated encumbrances, there is a recorded access easement over the property that was granted to a third party.

The Easement Acceptance Committee recommends acceptance of the Gibson Tract easement offer as presented, subject to the following revised conditions:

1. The demolition and/or removal of the existing non-historic buildings and structures and rehabilitation of the landscape shall be completed within three (3) calendar years of the date of recordation of the easement.
2. Prior to recordation, any change to the timeframe for demolition or removal of the existing non-historic buildings and structures shall be negotiated in advance with DHR.
3. Demolition and removal of the existing non-historic buildings and structures shall be subject to a written management plan to be negotiated jointly by CWT and DHR and such plan shall be incorporated directly or by reference into the deed of easement.
4. The deed of easement will include indemnification and hold harmless language for any claims or causes of action arising from the access easement granted to a third party that runs with the land and that the Board shall not be responsible for any costs associated with such access easement.

Comments Summary:

Dr. Fairfax made a motion to approve the revised easement offer as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Fisher and the Board voted unanimously to approve the motion.

4. Shiflett Tracts, Trevilian Station Battlefield, Louisa County

Property Owner: Civil War Trust

Acreage: 71

Located approximately five miles west of the Town of Louisa, the Shiflett Tracts contain four tax parcels totaling 71 acres of land. Comprised of a combination of mature wooded cover, open agricultural fields, and grass lawn, the property has been used for residential, agricultural, and forestal purposes, including livestock (cattle) and orchard production. The property lies within the core area of the 1864 Trevilian Station Battlefield. The CWT acquired the property in 2014 in part with grant funding from the ABPP and VBPF. Residential improvements on the property include two frame dwellings, one detached concrete block garage, one frame shed, one frame workshop, well, and septic. Agricultural improvements include one frame barn with shed addition, one frame chicken coop, and two frame equipment sheds. Most of the residential and agricultural improvements are clustered in the central western portion of the property near an adjacent railroad line.

The Board initially reviewed and approved the easement offer for the Shiflett Tracts at its September 18, 2014 meeting, subject to the following conditions:

1. DHR reviews and approves the terms of any lease agreements prior to their execution to ensure that any rights conveyed via the lease do not conflict with the easement.
2. The proposed lease for the non-historic residential dwelling on Parcel 23-138 does not extend past the seven (7) year period negotiated by the CWT.
3. Demolition or removal of existing non-historic buildings and structures on the property shall be completed within two (2) years of the end of the lease period. Any change to the time frame for demolition or removal of existing buildings and structures as determined by the Board shall be negotiated in advance with the DHR.
4. Demolition or removal of existing non-historic buildings and structures and rehabilitation or restoration of the landscape shall be conducted according to a written management plan negotiated jointly by the Civil War Trust and the DHR, and such plan shall be incorporated into the easement either directly or by reference.

At its December 12, 2015 meeting, the Board approved the following revised conditions:

1. The CWT will notify DHR within thirty business days of the termination of the existing residential lease. The existing lease shall not be extended or renewed extended or renewed beyond the initial seven (7) year period and shall not be
2. Extended or renewed beyond the initial seven (7) year period and shall not be re-instated if terminated before then.
3. Any lease in effect at the time of recordation must be subordinated to the easement.
4. Demolition and removal of existing non-historic buildings and structures shall be completed within three (3) years of the termination of the existing residential lease.
5. Prior to recordation, any change to the time frame for demolition or removal of existing non-historic buildings and structures as determined by the Board shall be negotiated in advance with DHR.
6. Demolition and removal of existing buildings and structures or rehabilitation or restoration of the landscape shall be conducted according to a written management plan negotiated jointly by the CWT and the DHR, and such plan shall be incorporated into the easement either directly or by reference.

Easement Program staff made a site visit to the property in August 2016 to obtain updated photographs and information for the baseline documentation report and discovered a substantial amount of trash, junk, and debris discovered throughout the property. This included approximately 50 tires, a car bumper, metal cattle gates and feeders, gas cans, oil cans, metal barrels, plastic barrels, a sink, a toilet, a tub, a large "BASF" container for the transport of liquid chemicals, creosote coated railroad ties, insulation, metal pipes, a commercial grade refrigerator, a large concrete cistern, /stack of large Styrofoam blocks, rolls of chain link metal fencing, and numerous glass bottles, plates, and metal bottles. Most of these items were discovered in the densely wooded areas of the property not previously visited.

The EAC was apprised of the circumstances regarding the existing trash and debris on the property at its August 22, 2016 meeting. Additionally, staff notified the CWT about the issue and provided photographic documentation from the site visit, as well as an outline of the measures that would need to be taken to address the problem.

The CWT subsequently provided DHR with a copy of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment ("ESA") for the property, completed by Pyramid Environmental & Engineering, P.C. in August 2014. The purpose of the Phase I Environmental Assessment is to render an independent professional opinion about the environmental condition of the property. Based on the findings of the Phase I ESA, Pyramid had no recommendations for any further environmental evaluations or a Phase II ESA.

The Easement Acceptance Committee recommends acceptance of the Shiflett Tract easement offer as presented, subject to the following revised conditions:

1. Demolition and removal of the existing non-historic buildings and structures within three (3) calendar years of the termination of the residential lease.
2. Prior to recordation, any change to the timeframe for demolition or removal of the existing non-historic buildings and structures shall be negotiated in advance with DHR.
3. Demolition and removal of the existing non-historic buildings and structures shall be subject to a written management plan to be negotiated jointly by CWT and DHR and such plan shall be incorporated directly or by reference into the deed of easement.
4. The trash, junk and debris currently on the property shall be removed no later than December 31, 2017 and the standard restriction in the deed of easement regarding trash shall be revised accordingly. DHR will conduct a site visit to confirm compliance.
5. The deed of easement shall include additional indemnification language to address any environmental issues and liabilities arising from the trash, debris and junk.

Comments Summary:

Chair Smith directed Adam Gillenwater of CWT that they must remove the extensive trash found on the property. Ms. Kim made a motion to approve the revised easement offer as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Fisher and the Board voted unanimously to approve the motion.

5. Currie House, City of Blacksburg

Property Owner: Peter Trower and Marcella Griggs

Acreage: 0.50

Located on Highland Circle in the eastern portion of Blacksburg, the property contains one historic frame dwelling constructed in the Modern and International architectural styles and crafted of wood, glass, concrete, and brick. The dwelling, known as the Currie House, resides on a sloping site in the mid-twentieth century Highland Park subdivision. The house is complimented by an historic carport, and historic landscaping features such as Mt. Airy granite slab steps, gravel beds, and four functional concrete basins that catch rainwater. Designed by architect Leonard J. Currie as a residence for his family, the Currie House was built in 1961 by Charles Pascoe under Currie's close supervision. The dwelling is a significant example of the Modern Movement in residential architecture and was individually listed on the Virginia Landmarks Register and National Register of Historic Places in 1994 under Criterion C for Architecture, as a rare example of clear, formal contemporary design in southwest Virginia. From the street (Highland Circle), a series of poured concrete slabs steps down an incline to the main living floor of the house and a T-shaped driveway leads to the carport sited northeast of the house.

The property retains an extremely high level of integrity of design, setting, materials and workmanship, and was individually listed in the VLR/NRHP in 1994. The offer was approved by Board on March 20, 2014 with no conditions. However that approval has expired pursuant to *Easement Program Policy #2: Criteria for Acceptance of Easements* which states that standard approvals given by the Board are valid for two calendar years from the date of written approval by Easement Program Staff.

Request: Approval of the revised easement offer as presented, with no conditions.

Ms. Kim made a motion to approve the offer as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Fisher and the Board voted unanimously to approve the motion.

6. Jenks Tract, Glendale Battlefield, Henrico County

Property Owner: Civil War Trust

Acreage: 1.0

Fronting Darbytown Road in eastern Henrico County, the 1-acre Jenks Tract was most recently used for residential purposes. The property is comprised primarily of open lawn with a section of mature wooded cover at its northeastern corner. Access is made via a gravel drive. The Jenks Tract falls entirely within the core area of the Glendale Battlefield, which has been given a Preservation Priority Rating of I.3 Class B.

After acquiring the property in 2014 and in accordance with the conditions for approval set by the Board, the CWT and DHR executed a written Rehabilitation and Management Plan in September 2015 for demolition and removal of the non-historic residential improvements on the property and restoration of the battlefield landscape. The non-historic improvements were removed from the property according to the plan in September 2015, satisfying the Board's initial conditions for approval. Recordation of the easement was delayed until Henrico County provided written documentation that the proposed easement conformed to the County's current comprehensive plan, as required by Section 10.1-1701 of the Code of Virginia. This written confirmation was provided in August 2016.

Per the Board's *Easement Program Policy #2: Criteria for Acceptance of Easements*, standard approvals given by the Board are valid for two calendar years from the date of written approval by Easement Program Staff (effective September 19, 2013). Board approval for the Jenks Tract easement offer expired in March 2016.

Request: Approval of the revised offer as presented, with no conditions.

Ms. Kim made a motion to approve the offer as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Fisher and the Board voted unanimously to approve the motion.

7. Budjinski Tract, Glendale Battlefield, Henrico County

Property Owner: Civil War Trust

Acreage: 1.118

Fronting Darbytown Road in eastern Henrico County, the Budjinski Tract was most recently used for residential purposes. The property is comprised primarily of wooded cover with a section of grass lawn at its center. The Budjinski Tract falls within the core area of the Glendale Battlefield, which has been given a Preservation Priority Rating of I.3 Class B.

After acquiring the property in 2014 and in accordance with the conditions for approval set by the Board, the CWT and DHR executed a written Rehabilitation and Management Plan in September 2015 for demolition and removal of the non-historic residential improvements on the property and restoration of the battlefield landscape. The non-historic improvements were removed from the property according to the plan in September 2015, satisfying the Board's initial conditions for approval. Recordation of the easement was delayed until Henrico County provided written documentation that the proposed easement conformed to the County's current comprehensive plan, as required by Section 10.1-1701 of the Code of Virginia. This written confirmation was provided in August 2016.

Per the Board's *Easement Program Policy #2: Criteria for Acceptance of Easements*, standard approvals given by the Board are valid for two calendar years from the date of written approval by Easement Program Staff (effective September 19, 2013). Board approval for the Budjinski Tract easement offer expired in June 2016.

Request: Approval of the revised offer as presented, with no conditions.

Ms. Kim made a motion to approve the offer as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Fisher and the Board voted unanimously to approve the motion.

8. Parker Tract, Glendale Battlefield, Henrico County

Property Owner: Civil War Trust

Acreage: 34.30

Situated along Charles City Road, near the intersection of Long Bridge Road and Darbytown Road in Henrico, the 34-acre Parker Tract is comprised primarily of open-space cultivated agricultural fields bordered by wooded fencerows. The property has been used for both residential and agricultural purposes, and is currently cultivated primarily for crop production. The Parker Tract falls within the core area of the Glendale Battlefield, which has been given a Preservation Priority Rating of I.3 Class B.

After acquiring the property in 2013 and in accordance with the conditions for approval set by the Board, the CWT and DHR executed a written Rehabilitation and Management Plan in September 2015 for demolition and removal of the non-historic residential improvements on the property and restoration of the battlefield landscape. The non-historic improvements were removed from the property according to the plan in September 2015, satisfying the Board's initial conditions for approval.

However, recordation of the easement was delayed until Henrico County provided written documentation that the proposed easement conformed to the County's current comprehensive plan, as required by Section 10.1-1701 of the Code of Virginia. This written confirmation was provided in August 2016. More than three years have passed since the Board's initial approval and conditions on the property have changed.

Request: Approval of the revised offer as presented, with no conditions.

Mr. Fisher made a motion to approve the offer as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kim and the Board voted unanimously to approve the motion.

9. Bowie Tract, North Anna Battlefield, Caroline County

Property Owner: Civil War Trust

Acreage: 6.36

Located on the north bank of the North Anna River, the 6.36 acre Bowie Tract is comprised entirely of forested cover. Access to the parcel is via a gravel road exiting onto Oxford Road (VA Route 689). The tract contains the aboveground stone masonry ruins and archaeological deposits associated with the early 19th century Jericho Mill and was also the site of a Union pontoon bridge crossing during the May 23, 1864 Battle of North Anna. It also lies within the core area of the North Anna Battlefield as determined by the CWSAC, which has given the North Anna Battlefield a Preservation Priority I.3 Class B Rating. CWT acquired property in 2014.

The Board voted unanimously to approve an easement offer for the Bowie Tract property at its June 19, 2014 meeting with no conditions. Per the Board's *Easement Program Policy #2: Criteria for Acceptance of Easements*, standard approvals given by the Board are valid for two calendar years from the date of written approval by Easement Program Staff (effective September 19, 2013). Board approval for the Bowie Tract easement offer expired in June 2016.

Request: Approval of the offer as presented, with no conditions.

Ms. Kim made a motion to approve the offer as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Fisher and the Board voted unanimously to approve the motion.

10. Downing Tract, Kernstown Battlefield, Frederick County

Property Owner: Civil War Trust

Acreage: 35.95

Located off Apple Valley Road (State Route 652) just southwest of Winchester, the Downing Tract contains 35.95 acres of land. Comprised primarily of forested cover (primarily mixed hardwoods), the property is unimproved. The tract lies within the core area of the First Kernstown Battlefield as determined by the CWSAC, which has given the battlefield a Preservation Priority I.3 Class B Rating. The CWT acquired the property in June 2015.

Per the Board's *Easement Program Policy #2: Criteria for Acceptance of Easements*, standard approvals given by the Board are valid for two calendar years from the date of written approval by Easement Program Staff (effective September 19, 2013). Board approval of the Downing Tract easement offer will expire in December 2016.

The request is to approve the easement offer subject to the following revised and consolidated conditions:

1. Any previously recorded plats of subdivision that affect the property shall be vacated prior to recordation of the conservation easement.
2. The property contains more than 20 acres of forested cover and the standard forest management language, including language addressing any future landscape rehabilitation or land conversion activities, shall be included in the easement.

Ms. Kim made a motion to approve the offer as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Fisher and the Board voted unanimously to approve the motion.

New Easements Recorded Since the June 2016 HRB Meeting

Ms. Musumeci then brief the Board about the following recently recorded easement.

1. Komrowksi Tract, Brandy Station Battlefield, Culpeper County

Date Recorded: 06/24/16

Donor: Civil War Trust

Acreage: 3.72

Grant Program: American Battlefield Protection Program, Virginia Battlefield Preservation Fund

Ms. Musumeci stated that concluded her presentation.

Vice-Chair Peters asked staff to contact the property owners of the Stock Tract to survey the property and see if they would be willing for the eligibility of the property to be considered and recorded for the easement property. Ms. Musumeci said that easement program staff would inquire and that because CWT was seeking ABPP grant funding, the National Register eligibility of the resources would be evaluated as part of the Section 106 process. Vice-Chair Peters followed by saying that the property owners needed to know that the Board has concerns about the lack of protections for the buildings. Chair Smith asked that easement program staff apprise the Board of any determinations.

DHR Deputy Director Williams spoke to the Board about the requirements under FOIA for publication of the text of the 46 proposed replacement highway markers. She confirmed that the issue of concern is not amending the meeting agenda to include this item, but the fact that the marker text was not made available to the public for review. Consequently, the Board should not take a vote at the meeting and suggested holding a special meeting to consider the text. She also reminded the Board that the matter was urgent and could not wait until the December meeting of the Board. After discussion, the Board agreed to hold a special meeting for consideration of the replacement marker text.

Dr. Atkins-Spivey made a motion to defer a vote on the text for the 46 replacement markers meet on September 21, 2016 at noon at DHR's Richmond office to consider the item. Mr. Fisher seconded the motion and the Board voted unanimously to approve the motion.

Chair Smith adjourned the Board of Historic Resources meeting at 4:19 p.m.

STATE REVIEW BOARD

Academy Center of the Arts, Joy and Lynch Christian Warehouse Theatre, 609 Commerce Street, Lynchburg, VA 24504

State Review Board Members Present

Elizabeth Moore, Chair

Joseph D. Lahendro, Vice-Chair

Dr. Sara Bon-Harper

Dr. Gabrielle Lanier

Dr. Laurant Lee

Dr. Carl Lounsbury

John Salmon

State Review Board Members Absent

Dr. Gabrielle Lanier

Department of Historic Resources Staff Present

David Edwards
Jim Hare
Lena McDonald
Melina Bezirdjian
Mike Pulice
Aubrey Von Lindern
Marc Wagner
Elizabeth Lipford
Gillian Bears

Guests (from sign-in sheet): John Forsyth (Hull Street Station); Deb McClane (Belmont Neighborhood Historic District); Clyde Parker (Charles Street Gymnasium); Marcus Pollard (William Byrd High School); Elizabeth Terry Reynolds (Coles Terry Rural Historic District); Ann Rogers (Coles-Terry RHD); Frank H. Terry Jr. (Coles-Terry RHD); Grace Terry (Coles-Terry RHD); Troy and Rayna Williams (The Grove)

Chair Moore called the meeting to order at 12:50 p.m. for discussion and consideration of the Preliminary Information Applications (informal guidance session).

Preliminary Information Applications

The following proposals were *endorsed*, unless otherwise noted, with the following comments:

Northern Region.....presented by Aubrey Von Lindern

1. **Amos Goodin House, Loudoun County, #053-0468, Criterion C

The SRB recommended the property proceed to nomination.

2. **Appomattox Statue, City of Alexandria, #100-0284, Criterion C, Criteria Consideration F (commemorative property)

The SRB recommended that the property is eligible under Criterion C and meets Criteria Consideration. Vice-Chair Lahendro noted that the statue was a custom design and thus differentiated from mass-produced statues representing a variety of topics that have commonly been erected across Virginia. Acknowledging that a variety of monuments referencing the Civil War have been erected across Virginia, the SRB recommended that a MPD could be developed to provide a historic context within which to evaluate other Civil War memorials erected from the end of the Civil War through about 1966; however at this time, due to DHR's budget and staff constraints, no plans have been made to prepare such an MPD or contract with a private consultant to prepare an MPD.

3. Samuel B. Finley House, Augusta County, #007-1061, Criterion C

Vice-Chair Lahendro asked if the interior stenciling is original. Ms. Von Lindern said it is believed to be, but documentation has not yet been found to confirm this supposition. However, the stenciling certainly dates to the property's period of significance. Vice-Chair Lahendro recommended that a nomination should include a comparison of this dwelling's stenciling with similar documented examples at other properties in the vicinity.

4. **Mount Vernon High School, Fairfax County, #029-0230, Criteria A and C

The SRB recommended the property proceed to nomination.

5. Paul's Ottobine Mill, Rockingham County, #082-5652, Criteria A and C

Vice-Chair Lahendro recommended that a nomination should describe how the mill operated historically as a grist mill and roller mill. The Board members noted that it is increasingly rare to find a historic mill that retains a large amount of historic milling equipment as this property does.

6. Presqu'Isle, Culpeper County, #023-0016, Criteria A and C

Chair Moore asked if Doug Sanford included this property in his recent statewide survey of slave quarters and Ms. Von Lindern said yes.

7. **Pride of Fairfax Lodge, Fairfax County, #029-6069, Criterion A

Chair Moore asked if other properties recently have been nominated that have high historical association values but physical alterations. Mr. Wagner and Mr. Pulice noted the Mechanicsville Historic District. Vice-Chair Lahendro asked if the building's interior floor plan is known to have been changed over the years and, if so, whether this can be described in a nomination. Mr. Pulice said a fraternal lodge in the Blacksburg area may be a comparable example of an African American fraternal lodge. Ms. Lipford said a lodge in Essex County also may be comparable. Dr. Bon-Harper and Dr. Lee noted that the property's continuity of use as the site of an African American fraternal lodge for more than a century is of central importance to its eligibility for the Registers. Dr. Lee said Gum Springs has a community group dedicated to documenting the history of Gum Springs and may be a source of additional information.

8. Shiloh Baptist Church, Town of Middleburg, Loudoun County, #259-0162-0007, Criteria A and C, Criteria Consideration A

The SRB recommended the property proceed to nomination.

9. **Thomasson Barn, Prince William County, #076-0285, Criterion C

Chair Moore asked if the barn is associated with mechanization of dairy farming. Mr. Wagner said yes, and noted that extant barns with original tile materials are very rare in Virginia, with perhaps 15 documented across the state. Vice-Chair Lahendro recommended a nomination include an explanation of each section of the barn's historic use. The widespread availability of 1920s standardized agricultural building catalogs is believed to make this description a relatively simple task.

Western Region.....presented by Michael Pulice

1. William Byrd High School, Town of Vinton, Roanoke County, #149-0038, Criteria A and C

Chair Moore asked about the property's current use. Mr. Pollard said it is currently vacant. The property's former shop building and the ballfield will be retained under County ownership while the school building will be sold to private ownership. All three of these resources are contributing to the property.

2. Coles-Terry Rural Historic District, Roanoke County, #080-5689, Criteria A and C

Chair Moore asked about the historic district's potential for archaeological significance. Mr. Pulice said sites have been identified on the property but not investigated sufficiently to establish significance. Vice-Chair Lahendro asked how many properties are within the district. The property owner said about five separate tax parcels with associated buildings are in the district. Vice-Chair Lahendro asked how the historic boundary was delineated. Mr. Pulice said the boundary is based on boundaries of lands owned by the Coles and Terry families since the mid-19th century. Chair Moore asked about the significance of the date 1835 and Mr. Pulice said that indicates the first land acquisition by one of the families.

3. The Grove, Campbell County, #015-0220, Criterion C

The property owner said The Grove was owned by James Pin in the mid-18th century, and then it conveyed to Christopher Clark. It is speculated that elements from an earlier house were re-used when The Grove was constructed. Dr. Lounsbury recommended that the house could have been constructed about ten years earlier than was stated in the PIF, based on details of the chimneys' construction. Mr. Salmon suggested that local land records could be consulted to find additional information about the property's history.

4. The Highlands, Henry County, #044-5576, Criterion C

The SRB recommended the property proceed to nomination.

5. Hopwood Hall, Lynchburg College, City of Lynchburg, #118-0152, Criteria A and C

The SRB recommended the property proceed to nomination.

Eastern Region.....presented by Marc Wagner and Elizabeth Lipford

1. ***Belmont Neighborhood Historic District, City of Charlottesville, #104-5082, Criteria A and C

Vice-Chair Lahendro asked about the delineation of the district's boundaries. Mr. Wagner said DHR staff and Charlottesville CLG staff drove throughout the district and its environs, and determined that the proposed boundaries encompass a visually cohesive area. Vice-Chair Lahendro and Dr. Bon-Harper described residential streets that are within Belmont's original 1891 plat and often considered part of today's Belmont neighborhood; these areas are historically associated with the streets within the proposed district boundaries, retain physical integrity, and feature representative examples of evolving architectural styles and development patterns as the original plat became built out. Consequently, potential for future increases to the district boundaries is anticipated. Mr. Wagner noted that, to control project costs, a phased approach to the historic district's survey and nomination was decided to be used. Ms. McClane said that widening of Monticello Avenue had changed the physical characteristics of the 1891 plat by separating the neighborhood into "North Belmont" and "South Belmont," and the proposed HD could be nominated as the North Belmont Historic District.

2. Charles Street Gymnasium, City of Franklin, #145-5033, Criteria A and C

Clive Parker explained that the property is visually prominent, especially from other historic properties in a nearby historic district and from Franklin Park, which dates to the early 20th century. He said the property is owned by the City of Franklin school system, which supports the property being nominated for the Registers.

3. **Higgins Doctors Office Building, City of Richmond, #127-7028, Criterion C

Vice-Chair Lahendro asked if the architectural firm that designed this building also created other Wrightian designs. Mr. Wagner said the firm had several Modern projects in the DC area, including the National Arboretum and a couple of schools. The firm later segued into International-style projects.

4. **Hull Street Station, City of Richmond, #127-5009, Criteria A and C

John Forsyth, a representative for the Old Dominion Railway Museum, said that the building has served as a museum since the 1980s.

5. Quietude, Hanover County, #042-0189, Criterion C

Chair Moore recommended that the property's archaeological features be included in a nomination.

6. **Rockfalls, City of Richmond, #127-7044, Criterion C

Chair Moore asked if the quarry on the property predates the house. Mr. Wagner said it dates to the mid-19th century and its presence was a factor in the selection of the house's construction site. Vice-Chair Lahendro suggested searching for historic views of the property, including its original landscape design.

7. **Yoffy House, City of Richmond, #127-6976, Criterion C

Vice-Chair Lahendro recommended an MPD for Frederick Hyland residential designs would be a good idea; staff agreed and will add it to a list of possible Modern architecture projects that DHR has on file. Vice-Chair Lahendro noted that original black-and-white publicity photos are available, showing the house when it was completed, and could be used to develop fuller understanding of its original design and construction materials and how the building evolved over the years.

Eastern Region.....presented by Gillian Bearn

1. Adam Thoroughgood House 2016 Update and Boundary Increase, City of Virginia Beach, #134-0033, Criteria A, B, C, and D

Chair Moore asked if other parcels may be added to the historic boundary in the future. Ms. Bearn said none are known at this time.

Chair Moore adjourned the SRB meeting at 4:45 p.m.